

Economic Note 1008 – ‘Violence Against Women and Girls and Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults’

The measures assessed in this Economic Note (EN) for “Violence Against Women and Girls and protection of children and vulnerable adults” are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1: Measures included in “Violence Against Women and Girls and protection of children and vulnerable adults”

Proposal	Measures included
<p>1. Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on registered sex offenders (RSOs) changing their name in certain circumstances • Reduce from superintendent to inspector the required police-officer rank to authorise warrant applications for the police to enter an RSO’s home to assess their risk of sexual harm • Require RSOs with convictions for sexual offences against children or that have been deemed by the police to be a sexual risk to children to notify the police in advance of entering a qualified premise where children are likely to be present • Require RSOs to notify in advance absences of more than five days from a previously notified residence • Give the police a power to receive notification virtually • Give the police a power to proactively consider and if suitable initiate an application for an RSO’s indefinite notification requirements to be discontinued once the 15 year minimum duration has elapsed • Application to Scotland and Northern Ireland of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 changes relating to prescribed police stations • Putting the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme on a statutory footing.
<p>2. Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the ‘Right to Know’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets out the process the police should follow when considering releasing identifying information about a stalking suspect to the victim. • Introducing a new power for the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Home Secretary) to issue multi-agency statutory guidance on stalking. • Introduce a specific requirement for the Home Secretary to issue guidance for the police only on releasing identifying information of a stalker to the victim or any potential victim of that stalking.
<p>3. Child Criminal Exploitation (CCE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a new, standalone offence of Child Criminal Exploitation (CCE), powers for the courts to make civil preventative orders and a power for the Home Secretary to

	<p>issue statutory guidance in relation to the offence and orders, to explicitly recognise CCE as a specific form of offending</p>
<p>4. Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the courts to make a Stalking Protection Order at the conclusion of criminal proceedings of their own volition, whether the defendant was convicted or acquitted of an offence.
<p>5. Cuckooing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing a new offence of cuckooing to criminalise the non-consensual control of another person’s dwelling in connection with the commission of certain criminal offence/s
<p>6. Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a new criminal offence in relation to fine-tuned artificial intelligence (AI) models designed to produce child sexual abuse material (CSAM) • Introduce a new criminal offence of possessing guidance on creating synthetic or partially synthetic CSAM • Introduce a new criminal offence for administrators and moderators of child sexual abuse (CSA) sites • Introduce a new power for Border Force to compel individuals to unlock their device to be searched for known CSAM.
<p>7. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) – Removal of supervision exemption</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure to remove supervision exemption, so relevant roles are defined as regulated activity, regardless of whether they are supervised or not.
<p>8. Introducing Grooming as a Statutory Aggravating Factor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforming the sentencing framework to introduce a new statutory aggravating factor for grooming behaviour.

Economic Note	Number: HO EN 1008
Title of regulatory proposal	Violence against women and girls
Lead Department/Agency	Home Office/Ministry of Justice
Expected date of implementation	From 1 st Quarter 2026
Origin	Domestic
Date	10 February 2025
Lead Departmental Contact	CrimeandPolicingBillTeam@homeoffice.gov.uk
Departmental Assessment	GREEN
<u>Rationale for intervention, objectives and intended effects</u>	
Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name	
<p>Strengthen the regime for managing registered sex offenders, by making advance the requirements for registered sex offenders to notify changes of name, absence from their home address for more than five days and – in respect of registered sex offenders that pose a specific risk to children – entry into a specified premises where children are present. The notification requirement changes will likely impact the number of breaches committed by offenders, leading to additional costs or cost savings dependent on the measure. The additional breaches as a result of the changes to the ‘absence from home address’ notification requirement will be countered by the police’s improved ability to monitor potentially high-risk RSOs. The police will also be given a power to restrict registered sex offenders’ changes of name on official documents, receive notification virtually in certain circumstances and proactively review indefinite notification requirements after an offenders’ minimum duration has elapsed.</p>	
Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the ‘Right to Know’	
<p>These measures will aim to improve the police’s understanding of their response to stalking by providing improved support and improve victim experience as a result. The legislation will include a power for the Home Secretary to issue statutory guidance on stalking and a power for the Home Secretary to issue statutory guidance to the police on the disclosure of information relating to stalking perpetrators and suspects.</p>	
Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation	
<p>A new offence of CCE will be introduced alongside civil preventative orders and statutory guidance. Government intervention is needed to strengthen the criminal justice system (CJS) response to perpetrators who criminally exploit children and to improve outcomes for victims. This intervention will support the government’s Safer</p>	

Streets Mission by reducing the risk of children being drawn into violent crime by gangs.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

The strategic objective of the intervention is to provide better protections for victims of stalking and improve the CJS response to stalking. This rationale for government intervention is improved equity in society, as victims and survivors will have greater levels of protection from potentially high-risk perpetrators.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

Introducing a new offence of cuckooing to criminalise the non-consensual control of another person's dwelling in connection with the commission of certain criminal offence/s. Government intervention is needed to address the exploitative act of taking over a person's home for criminal purposes without their consent. This will strengthen the CJS response to cuckooing and improve outcomes for victims and society.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

The four CSA measures are designed to keep legislation up to date with the changing nature of online sexual abuse and the increasing prevalence of artificial intelligence (AI) generated CSAM and to prevent the creation and redistribution of images.

The four measures will mean legislation is reflective of the severity and scale of online related CSA with offenders receiving appropriate sentences for the harm caused and the threat of legislation should deter some criminal activity. Specifically:

A new criminal offence in relation to fine-tuned artificial intelligence (AI) models will close a legislative gap by criminalising the creation, possession, or distribution of such digital files or models which are designed to create CSAM (indecent photographs, pseudo-photographs or prohibited images as defined by the Protection of Children Act 1978 or section 62 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009).

Criminalising the possession of an AI paedophile manual will extend the existing possession of a paedophile manual offence to specifically cover AI related images.

A new specific and appropriate offence will be created for administrators and moderators of electronic services who facilitate the production or distribution of CSAM.

Border Force officer powers will be extended to compel individuals to unlock their devices for search on suspicion of possession of digital CSAM. The consequence of the obstruction offence is intended to act as an incentive for individuals to comply with the search or otherwise face arrest and device seizure.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

Employers for roles in regulated activity can check if a prospective employee is barred by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) from working with children, unless that role is supervised. This measure removes the supervision exemption

from the definition of regulated activity with children, to reduce the risk of a barred person working with children in a supervised capacity. This measure responds to a recommendation in the final report by the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA)

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

This measure will aggravate the sentences of offenders who demonstrate grooming behaviours in connection to sexual offences against those under 18 and those who knowingly take advantage of children who they know to have been groomed by others. It will enable courts to ensure that those who groom children face the toughest possible sentences for their crimes, giving victims and the public confidence that justice has been served.

Policy options (including alternatives to regulation)

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

Option 0: 'Do nothing': Maintain the current notification requirements for registered sex offenders (RSOs) in Part 2 of the Sexual Offences Act (SOA) 2003

Option 1: Strengthen the notification requirements for RSOs by (1) making certain existing requirements (to notify new names, entry into premises where children are present and absence from a sole or main residence) notifiable in advance; (2) improving efficiency in the notification requirements system by enabling the police to receive virtual notification, proactively review indefinite notification requirements after the minimum duration has elapsed and lowering the rank of officer authorised to obtain a warrant to enter and search an RSO's home to risk assess them, and (3) giving the police a power to prohibit RSOs from changing their names on official documents (where there is a risk that a name change will be used for further offending). Improve the consistency of the police's disclosure of information to prevent sexual harm by issuing statutory guidance on disclosing information about RSOs and those that pose a risk of sexual harm. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option:

The notification requirements for registered sex offenders are in legislation. Any amendments to the notification requirements for sex offenders require amendments to legislation. No non-regulatory options were considered.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

Option 0: 'Do nothing': This would not address the gaps the government has identified in the need for clear and consistent guidance on what stalking is.

Option 1: Introducing a new power for the Home Secretary to issue multi-agency statutory guidance on stalking, including a power for the Home Secretary to issue guidance for the police on releasing identifying information about a suspect to a victim of stalking. In both cases, the professionals this guidance is for will be required to pay due regard to it. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Option 2 (non-legislative): Issue non-statutory guidance, this is not a viable option because there is no requirement for professionals to pay due regard to it and therefore the guidance would not have as strong of an effect.

Non-regulatory option:

Option 2 is a non-regulatory option, in which non-statutory guidance on stalking and 'Right to Know' would be issued to the relevant agencies e.g. police, courts, and probation officers. This has not been taken forward as it is assumed that the legislative power would have a stronger effect.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

Option 0: 'Do nothing'. Police would continue to use existing legislation, such as the Modern Slavery Act 2015, inchoate offences or existing civil preventative orders, to tackle the criminal exploitation of children.

Option 1: Introduce a new, standalone offence of CCE, together with statutory guidance and civil preventative orders, to explicitly recognise CCE as a specific form of offending. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option:

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

Option 0: 'Do nothing' means SPOs will not be available on conviction or acquittal. This means restraining orders will likely be used in these circumstances. These have not been specifically designed to address stalking behaviour and do not have the ability to impose positive requirements that address the root causes of the offending behaviour.

Option 1: Enable the courts to make a Stalking Protection Order (SPO) at the conclusion of criminal proceedings of their own volition. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option:

The government considered the non-regulatory option of producing guidance alone. This guidance would advise the police, courts, and probation officers on how to effectively issue restraining orders. This option has not been taken forward as it would not incorporate the benefits of the positive requirements that form part of the Stalking Protection Order.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

Option 0: 'Do nothing'. Police would continue to use existing tools and powers to address cuckooing, such as Closure Orders and drugs offences, however these measures are not commensurate with the harm caused by cuckooing nor are they considered to support the best possible outcomes for victims.

Option 1: Introduce a new offence of cuckooing to criminalise the specific act of cuckooing, drive a consistent national police response and improve outcomes for victims, supported by accompanying non-statutory guidance. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option: The government considered the non-regulatory option of producing guidance alone. While guidance could result in improved awareness of cuckooing and a more consistent policing response, it would not lead to the benefits anticipated to arise as a result of introducing an offence.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

Option 0: 'Do nothing'

Option 1: Amend legislation to introduce four measures designed to address online and AI related CSA. This will include a new criminal offence in relation to fine-tuned AI models designed to produce CSAM. A new criminal offence of possessing guidance on creating synthetic or partially synthetic CSAM. A new criminal offence for administrators and moderators of CSA sites; and extend powers of Border Force officers to compel individuals to unlock their device to be searched for known CSAM. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option: The measures amend legislation and as such no non-regulatory options were considered.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

Option 0: Do nothing. These supervised roles remain eligible only for an enhanced DBS check, without a check of the Children's Barred List. This will not deal with the risk that a barred person could work with children in a supervised capacity, nor address the recommendation made by IICSA.

Option 1: Remove the supervision exemption from the relevant legislation, so that anyone who works in these kinds of activity, for example teaching or supervising children, on a frequent basis, fits within the definition of regulated activity and is eligible for an enhanced with barred list check from the DBS. This would fulfil this element of IICSA's recommendations. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option: No non-regulatory options were considered, eligibility for DBS checks is prescribed in legislation so a non-legislative option for addressing this issue is not available.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

Option 0: 'Do nothing': There would remain no legislation to give effect to these measures.

Option 1: The government brings forward legislation to reform the sentencing framework and introduce grooming as a statutory aggravating factor. This will toughen sentences for the worst offenders, by targeting those who prey on vulnerable people, and provide greater public protection whilst supporting the government's mission to tackle violence against women and girls. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Non-regulatory option: There are no non-regulatory options as aggravating factors are prescribed in legislation, so a non-legislative option does not meet the government's aims.

Costs and benefit summary

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name Total estimated costs range between £4.8 and £37.9 million, with a central estimate of £14.7 million. The total monetised benefits range between £4.6 and £12.2 million, with a central estimate of £7.8 million. The NPSV ranges between -£0.2 and -£25.7 million, with a central estimate of -£6.9 million. However, non-monetised benefits such as improved public protection and more effective, efficient management systems of RSOs are not included.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

Current guidance development is in early stages, so a fully monetised appraisal has not been possible. Costs and benefits have been qualitatively assessed.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

Total costs of the policy, discounted over 10 years, are estimated to be between £13.4 million and £50.1 million, with a central estimate of £20.3 million. This translates to an estimated annual ongoing cost of £1.2 million to £4.0 million, with a central estimate of £1.8 million. It has not been possible to monetise the benefits of this policy due to insufficient data and evidence.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

The total estimated costs for the policy range between -£56.7 million and £21.9 million, with a central estimate of -£21.9 million. The low and central estimates assume that the net impact of the policy will generate a cost saving for the government.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

Total costs of this policy are estimated to be between £7.1 million and £9.1 million, with a central estimate of £8.0 million (PV). This translates to an estimated annual ongoing cost of £0.26 million to £0.33 million per year, with a central estimate of £0.30 million (PV). It has not been possible to monetise the benefits of this policy due to insufficient data and evidence.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

Total estimated costs range for the four measures is between **£28 and £88 million** with a central estimate of **£56 million**. There are no monetised benefits due to a lack of existing evidence and data. However, significant non-monetised benefits include limiting the pool of people either proliferating, creating, and facilitating access to child sexual abuse images, and deterring others from engaging in these types of activities through AI generation.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

The number of affected individuals that would be brought into Regulated Activity, and required to undertake an enhanced with barring check, is unknown meaning that costs cannot be monetised. Instead, these have been assessed qualitatively. The benefits, such as improved safeguarding, are also difficult to monetise and hence have been qualitatively assessed.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

It has not been possible to quantify any costs for this measure at this point due to the limited data available. The benefits to this change are non-monetised and hence have been qualitatively assessed.

This measure will reflect the seriousness with which this government responds to this type of offending, ensuring the punishment fits these horrific crimes. It will aggravate the sentences of offenders who demonstrate grooming behaviours in connection to sexual offences against those under 18 and those who knowingly take advantage of children who they know to have been groomed by others. It will enable courts to ensure that those who groom children face the toughest possible sentences for their crimes, giving victims and the public confidence that justice has been served.

Risks

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

There is significant uncertainty in the modelling due to an absence of data on breaches of the notification requirements and uncertainty surrounding the targeted watchlist approach; sensitivity analysis is used to mitigate this risk.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

As the statutory guidance is in early stages of development and the length is not finalised, it is not possible to quantify any familiarisation costs to police and other agencies at this time.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

The key risk is whether the offence will be used effectively in practice, as stakeholders have identified difficulties with obtaining charges and convictions for exploitative behaviours under existing legislation. Statutory guidance relating to the exercise of police functions in relation to the new offence is being developed to mitigate this risk.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

There is uncertainty over the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) estimates for the ongoing prison unit cost. A risk that the omission of the quantitative benefit of positive requirements in reducing levels of reoffending due to a lack of evidence, may lead to an underestimation of the cost savings generated by the policy. The displacement rate of restraining orders to SPOs is not based on any CJS data.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

There is limited data to inform the current prevalence of cuckooing cases, which drive the cost estimates of this policy. There are risks that victims may refuse to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination of other offences, and that victims of CCE may be incriminated. The Home Office will draft guidance alongside this offence to mitigate these risks.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

There is significant uncertainty in the modelling due to an absence of evidence on the prevalence of AI and the rate at which it will change over time. Sensitivity analysis is used to mitigate this risk.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

The range of settings affected by this change is extensive and the requirements to which they are subject varies, so it is hard to estimate the numbers who will access the enhanced with barred list checks on the basis of this change.

While supervised roles are currently eligible for enhanced checks, there is no requirement on employers to undertake enhanced checks. However, in some sectors there are requirements on employers to undertake enhanced with barred list checks for those in RA. There is a risk in assuming that the current number of enhanced checks for the child workforce can accurately predict the numbers who will be affected, due to these different requirements relating to DBS checks.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

It has not been possible to quantify any costs for this measure at this point due to the limited data available. It is expected that there will be additional investigative work and evidential gathering required by the police and CPS to evidence grooming

behaviour. There also may be additional CPS and Legal Aid Agency costs of cases take longer at court due to the additional evidence being presented.

This may have a knock-on effect for other cases by delaying their start if evidence takes longer to be presented. Additionally, it is expected that this measure would increase sentence lengths for relevant offenders which would have prison place implications.

Summary of All Measures			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
76.12	34.25	N/A	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
7.8	-67.92	0	N/A
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
2025/26	2025/26	10	See Annex B
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Gisela Carr Caroline Hart Christian Papaleontiu Shehla Husain Andrew Meads	Date: 10/02/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Evidence Base

A. Policy objectives and intended effects

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

1. The government has committed to halving levels of violence against women and girls (VAWG) in a decade, including by using every tool available to target perpetrators of VAWG crimes. VAWG crimes are those that disproportionately – but not exclusively – impact women and girls, such as sexual offences. The Crime Survey for England and Wales found that in the year ending June 2024, 2.2 per cent of adults aged 16 and over had experienced sexual assault in the preceding year¹, and previous estimates on the cost of crime developed by the Home Office in 2015/16 have shown the economic and social costs of sexual violence total approximately £16.2 billion annually in 2024/25 prices.²
2. The legislative changes proposed in this EN are intended to strengthen the notification requirements for registered sex offenders (RSOs). They will improve the monitoring of RSOs' name changes, domestic travel and access to children, as well as prohibit certain RSOs from changing their names on official documents where there is a risk that name change will be used to enable further sexual offending. The changes will also enable the police to manage the risk RSOs pose in the UK and abroad more efficiently and put police guidance on a statutory footing to ensure consistency and application across forces.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

3. On 27 September 2024, a report³ setting out findings of a super-complaint on the police response to stalking was published by His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMICFRS), the Independent Office of Police Conduct (IOPC), and the College of Policing. The report set out nine recommendations directed to the government.
4. Introducing a power for the Home Secretary to issue multi-agency statutory guidance on stalking is a direct response to a recommendation for the Home Office in the super-complaint. The government is committed to improving the police and other agencies' understanding of stalking and providing a single and consistent interpretation of what stalking is.
5. The statutory guidance would include a definition of stalking and advice for professionals to help them identify stalking, thereby help better protect victims. The guidance would also provide information on how statutory agencies can work together to deal with stalking. The government expects that this will support agencies when dealing directly with stalking cases by providing a framework to help them respond and guide them on who to work with.

¹ ONS (2024). Crime in England and Wales: year ending June 2024. Available at: [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearendin gjune2024#:~:text=Latest%20estimates%20from%20the%20CSEW%20for%20year%20ending%20\(YE\)%20June,an%20increase%20in%20sexual%20assault.](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearendin gjune2024#:~:text=Latest%20estimates%20from%20the%20CSEW%20for%20year%20ending%20(YE)%20June,an%20increase%20in%20sexual%20assault.)

² GOV.UK (2018). The Economic and Social Costs of Crime. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-economic-and-social-costs-of-crime>

³ GOV.UK (2022). Super-complaint on the police response to stalking. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/super-complaint-on-the-police-response-to-stalking>

6. The government also committed in its manifesto to giving victims the right to know the identity of their online stalker.⁴ There is anecdotal evidence that the police are currently taking an overly risk-averse approach and not releasing identifying information on suspects, for fear of breaching data protection legislation. The reality is there are comprehensive processes they can follow. The policy intent is to clearly set this out in statutory guidance, so the police have something to guide them, and victims have a process they can point to

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

7. CCE is a form of child abuse where a child is exploited into taking part in criminal activity, often by criminal gangs. County Lines exploitation is one of the most recognised forms of child criminal exploitation⁵, whereby drug-dealing gangs manipulate and coerce children into drug running across the country, often exposing them to violence, threats, and intimidation. It has a devastating impact on victims, subjecting them to a range of harms.
8. Depending on the facts of a particular case, there is existing legislation that can be used to prosecute CCE, such as offences under the Modern Slavery Act 2015⁶ (MSA) and inchoate offences under the Serious Crime Act 2007⁷ (SCA). However, stakeholder engagement has identified some evidential challenges that police claim they experience with applying existing legislation that can present obstacles to obtaining successful prosecutions against CCE.
9. There is also a significant gap between the number of children known to social services as being at risk of CCE⁸, compared to the number of prosecutions against perpetrators under modern slavery and inchoate offences. This supports the need for a specific offence to increase awareness of CCE, recognise the harm caused to the child, and provide a strong deterrent to increase overall prosecutions and convictions for this behaviour.
10. The purpose of this policy is to introduce a standalone offence for CCE accompanied by statutory guidance and specific civil preventative orders. As a package this will increase prosecutions against those perpetrating CCE, improve identification of victims and increase earlier intervention to help prevent offending and protect victims.
11. It is possible that a standalone CCE offence and accompanying orders could also act as a deterrent to criminals. Engagement with police forces has suggested that criminals specifically avoid being labelled as child exploiters or human traffickers. Enhancing law enforcement agencies' ability to charge individuals with such offences, coupled with increased penalties may reduce the likelihood of the recruitment of children.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

12. The government has committed to strengthening Stalking Protection Orders (SPOs) to ensure they are used more effectively and managed appropriately when in place. This measure forms part of that commitment, and it is intended to contribute to improving the criminal justice

⁴ Labour Party Manifesto: <https://labour.org.uk/change/take-back-our-streets/>

⁵ Exploited and Criminalised; Barnardo's <https://www.barnardos.org.uk/sites/default/files/2021-10/Exploited%20and%20Criminalised%20report.pdf>

⁶ Modern Slavery Act 2015: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/30/contents>

⁷ Serious Crime Act 2007: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2007/27/contents>

⁸ Children in Need data: <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-in-need>

response to victims of stalking, providing better protections for those victims, and reducing the prevalence of stalking by deterring and preventing perpetrators from re-offending.

13. The Stalking Protection Act 2019⁹ currently enables the police to apply to a Magistrates' Court for a SPO, which can be put in place at any time. The test is that:
 - a. a defendant has carried out acts associated with stalking
 - b. they pose a risk associated with stalking to another person
 - c. the proposed order is necessary to protect another person from such a risk according to the police and other relevant agencies.¹⁰
14. Currently, the courts cannot make SPOs without an application being made by the police.
15. This measure would provide for the courts to make an SPO at the conclusion of criminal proceedings of their own volition, whether the defendant was convicted or acquitted of an offence. This is in relation to all perpetrators. Restraining orders are the tool currently used in this scenario, however, they are not the most appropriate tool in stalking cases as unlike SPOs, they cannot impose positive requirements (for example, to require the person subject to the order to attend a stalking perpetrator programme to address the root causes of their behaviour).

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

16. Cuckooing is an exploitative practice whereby criminals target and take over the homes of vulnerable people for the purpose of criminal activity. The activity is commonly related to the storage, preparation, and sale of illegal drugs but police have also reported cases of cuckooing where sexual, weapon and fraud offences take place.
17. While there are a range of applicable offences and orders that can currently be used in cuckooing cases, consultation with police and other stakeholders has identified that existing legislation does not reflect the exploitative nature of cuckooing or the harm to victims.
18. The objective of this policy is to create a cuckooing offence which will specifically target the legislative gap around the non-consensual control of another person's dwelling for the purpose of enabling it to be used in connection with the commission of criminal activity.
19. The intended effects of the policy are to reduce the harm to victims and to wider communities by reducing incidence of associated anti-social behaviour and criminality. Additionally, making cuckooing an offence will also allow for consistent national reporting and a more informed prevalence estimate of cuckooing than is currently available.
20. The introduction of a cuckooing offence and relevant non statutory guidance should reduce victim harm and promote safeguarding by strengthening the police and other services' ability to respond to cases. Increased identification and investigation of cuckooing incidents as a result of this legislation should increase the associated risks to perpetrators, which may act as a deterrent, potentially reducing the prevalence of cuckooing.

⁹ Legislation UK. Stalking Protection Act 2019 Available at: [Stalking Protection Act 2019](#)

¹⁰ Legislation UK. Stalking Protection Act 2019. Available at: [Stalking Protection Act 2019](#)

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

21. The four CSA measures aim to keep legislation up to date with the changing nature of online child sexual abuse which is seeing an increasing prevalence of AI generated child sexual abuse material, and to prevent the creation and redistribution of images of online images.
22. The measures will mean legislation is reflective of the severity and scale of online related CSA with offenders receiving appropriate sentences for the harm caused and the threat of legislation should deter some criminal activity. The four measures are:
 - A new offence which criminalises the creation, possession, or distribution of such digital files or models which are designed to create CSAM (indecent photographs, pseudo-photographs or prohibited images).¹¹
 - An extension to the existing possession of a paedophile manual offence to criminalise the possession of an AI paedophile manual.
 - The creation of a specific and appropriate offence for administrators and moderators of electronic services who facilitate the production or distribution of CSAM.
 - Extension of Border Force officers' powers to compel individuals to unlock their devices for search on suspicion of possession of digital CSAM. The consequence of the obstruction offence is intended to act as an incentive for individuals to comply with the search or otherwise face arrest and device seizure.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

23. Regulated activity (RA) with children is defined in legislation, and those working in RA with children are eligible for the highest-level DBS check, the enhanced with barred list check. DBS maintains a list of those it has barred from working in RA, because it considers that they pose a risk to children. Roles that involve close and frequent work with children are in RA, unless they are subject to day-to-day supervision; this 'supervision exemption' is provided for in legislation.
24. The policy objective is to remove this exemption, so that these roles are defined as RA, regardless of whether they are supervised or not. This would enable employers/organisations to access enhanced DBS checks which include a check of the Children's Barred list, in line with the recommendation from IICSA¹², and reduce the risk of a barred person working with children in a supervised capacity.
25. It would also have the following effects:
 - a) a person who is on the Children's Barred list would commit an offence if they apply for or work in these supervised roles;
 - b) an employer who engages a Barred person in a supervised role would commit an offence;
 - c) should an employer dismiss a person in a supervised role for causing harm, or posing a risk of harm to a child, they have to refer that person to DBS so that they can be considered for barring.

¹¹ As defined by the Protection of Children Act 1978 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1978/37/contents> or section 62 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/25/section/62>.

¹² Independent Inquiry into Child Sex Abuse, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/iicsa-report-of-the-independent-inquiry-into-child-sexual-abuse>

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

26. The Bill will toughen sentences for the worst offenders, by targeting those who prey on vulnerable people, through statutory aggravating factors that will capture grooming behaviour (including those involved with grooming gangs).
27. This measure will make grooming a statutory aggravating factor in the sentencing of child sexual offences. An aggravating factor makes an offence more serious, potentially leading to a sentence uplift, and must be considered by the court in deciding the length of a sentence.
28. This new statutory aggravating factor will enable courts to reflect the seriousness of grooming behaviour, including by grooming gangs' members. It will capture offenders who demonstrate grooming behaviours in connection to sexual offences against those under 18 and those who knowingly take advantage of children who they know to have been groomed by others.

B. Policy options considered, including alternatives to regulation

Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

29. **Option 0: 'Do nothing':** Maintain the current notification requirements for Registers Sex Offenders (RSOs) in Part 2 of the SOA 2003.
30. **Option 1:** Strengthen the notification requirements for RSOs in Part 2 of the SOA 2003 so that:
 - a) name changes are notifiable in advance and the police may place restrictions on RSOs' name changes on official documents where there is a risk a change of name will be used to facilitate further sexual offending;
 - b) RSOs are required to notify absences of five days or more from their home address;
 - c) the rank of police officers able to authorise warrants to enter an RSO's home to risk assess them is reduced to Inspector (section 96B warrant);
 - d) child sex offenders and those without convictions for sexual offences against children but that pose a risk to children are required to notify in advance entry into a specified premises (for example, a household) where children are present; certain RSOs can notify virtually in specified circumstances;
 - e) the police can proactively review indefinite notification requirements after 15 years; and there is a new power for the Home Secretary to issue statutory guidance on disclosing information about registered sex offenders, both those who may pose a risk to children ("Sarah's Law")¹³ and more generally. This is also known as the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme (CSODS).

¹³ GOV.UK (2023). Sarah's Law Guidance. Available at: Find out if a person has a record for child sexual offences - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/find-out-if-a-person-has-a-record-for-child-sexual-offences#:~:text=Print%20this%20page-,Overview,by%20a%20convicted%20sex%20offender.>

31. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.** The 'Do nothing' does not give police the power to more effectively monitor RSOs, particularly those that are high-risk or pose risks to certain groups.

Non-regulatory option

32. The notification requirements for registered sex offenders are in legislation. Any amendments to the notification requirements for sex offenders require amendments to legislation. No non-regulatory options were considered.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

33. **Option 0: 'Do nothing'**. This would not address the gaps the government has identified in the need for clear and consistent guidance on what stalking is, and misunderstandings within police forces over what process to follow when releasing identifying information about a stalking victim.
34. **Option 1:** Introduce a new power for the Home Secretary to issue multi-agency statutory guidance on stalking, and a specific requirement for the Home Secretary to issue guidance for the police only on releasing identifying information of a stalker to the victim or any potential victim of that stalking. The legislation will require professionals to pay due regard to the guidance. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Non-regulatory option

35. Statutory guidance has been issued so professions have to have due regard to the guidance which in turn enables a consistent approach across statutory agencies that would not be achieved with non-statutory guidance

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

36. **Option 0: 'Do-nothing'**. The Home Office would make no legislative change, and (as now) depending on the facts of a particular case, CCE cases are likely to fall under the existing legislative framework of modern slavery and human trafficking under the MSA and be prosecutable under sections 44 to 46 of the SCA (inchoate offences). Challenges with obtaining successful prosecutions against CCE would persist and there would be no specific offence that recognises the harm involved in exploiting a child (rather than an adult), and no associated increase in awareness of CCE and subsequent improvement in the response to victims and perpetrators.
37. **Option 1:** Introduce a standalone offence of CCE to explicitly recognise CCE as a specific form of criminality and to introduce CCE civil preventative orders designed to increase earlier intervention and stop reoffending, as well as statutory guidance. Introducing a specific standalone offence, together with civil orders and statutory guidance, would support increased prosecutions against child exploiters by increasing awareness and thereby improving identification of victims and perpetrators. The orders will also better allow early intervention to protect vulnerable children, leading to benefits for those children at risk of CCE.

Non-regulatory options

38. The government's manifesto committed to introduce a new offence of child criminal exploitation, so no non-regulatory options were considered. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

39. **Option 0: 'Do-nothing'**. This would continue to see restraining orders made by the court at the conclusion of criminal proceedings, whether the defendant was convicted or acquitted of an offence. While the police could apply for an SPO, there will be scenarios where there is a gap, and restraining orders are used which are not specifically designed for stalking offences.
40. **Option 1:** The option of legislating to provide for the courts to make an SPO at the conclusion of criminal proceedings of their own volition directly addresses a known gap. SPOs are specifically designed to tackle stalking behaviour and they allow for positive requirements to be imposed such as attending a perpetrator programme, which is designed to tackle the root causes of the perpetrator's stalking behaviour. The government is pursuing non-regulatory measures, alongside legislative measures, in line with the government's commitment to strengthen SPOs. These include improving the police's understanding of SPOs and when to use them, supporting the police to effectively manage SPOs once in place and better aligning the process with other VAWG protective orders. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Non-regulatory options

41. The government considered the non-regulatory option of producing guidance alone. This guidance would advise the police, courts, and probation officers on how to effectively issue restraining orders. This option has not been taken forward as it would not incorporate the benefits of the positive requirements that form part of the Stalking Protection Order.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

42. **Option 0: 'Do-nothing'**. Police and partners would continue to use existing measures but there would be no specific offence to target the harm caused by cuckooing and no associated improvement in the response to victims and perpetrators.
43. **Option 1: Preferred option.** Introduce a new offence of cuckooing, which would support the government's Safer Streets Mission by tackling criminal behaviour linked to violence, drug dealing and anti-social behaviour. This offence would address the gap in legislation which means that, while action can currently be taken in relation to criminal activity associated with cuckooing, there is no specific criminal offence to respond to the highly harmful and exploitative act of taking over a person's home for criminal purposes without their consent. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Non-regulatory options

44. The government considered the non-regulatory option of producing guidance alone. While guidance could result in improved awareness of cuckooing and a more consistent policing response, it would not lead to the benefits anticipated to arise as a result of introducing an offence. Additionally, guidance alone would not be a satisfactory response to the harm that is caused by criminal perpetrators of cuckooing.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

45. **Option 0: 'Do nothing'**. This option would mean no legislation effecting these measures is introduced and the justice system would not be able to successfully prosecute perpetrators for the related offences. Border Force officers will remain unable to search the devices of individuals suspected to possess CSAM if the owner of a device does not consent to the search.
46. **Option 1:** Implement the four CSA related measures so that:
- The possession of fine-tuned AI models designed to produce CSAM is criminal.
 - Possessing guidance on creating synthetic or partially synthetic CSAM is criminal in line with the existing offence for the possession of a paedophile manual.
 - Administrating and moderating CSA sites is criminal.
 - Border Force officers have the power to compel individuals to unlock their device to be searched for known CSAM.
47. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option** as it meets a range of legislative gaps identified relating to online CSA and the role of AI. The 'Do nothing' option does not criminalise known activity of online CSA or give Border Force officers additional power to search for suspected CSAM.

Non-regulatory options

48. No non-regulatory options were considered.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

49. **Option 0: 'Do nothing'**. The supervision exemption remains in place so that those in roles that work closely and frequently with children, if supervised, are not eligible for the enhanced with children's barred list check, risking a barred person undertaking one of these roles. It would not fulfil the recommendation of the IICSA.
50. **Option 1:** That the supervision exemption within the legislative definition of RA is removed, so that people who work closely and frequently with children are in regulated activity and eligible for an enhanced DBS check which includes a check of the Children's Barred List, whether they are supervised or not. It would reduce the risk of a barred person working in one of these supervised roles; it would be an offence for them to do so, and it would be an offence for an employer to knowingly employ them in RA. This option would meet a recommendation from the IICSA¹⁴. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Non-regulatory option

51. None; eligibility for DBS checks is prescribed in legislation so a non-legislative option for addressing this issue is not available.

¹⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/iicsa-report-of-the-independent-inquiry-into-child-sexual-abuse>

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

52. **Option 0: ‘Do nothing’.** There would remain no legislation to give effect to these measures.
53. **Option 1:** The government brings forward legislation to reform the sentencing framework and introduce grooming as a statutory aggravating factor. This will toughen sentences for the worst offenders, by targeting those who prey on vulnerable people, and provide greater public protection whilst supporting the government’s mission to tackle violence against women and girls. **Option 1 is the government’s preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

Non-regulatory options

54. None; aggravating factors are prescribed in legislation, so a non-legislative option does not meet the government’s aims.

C. Past evaluations and rationale for government intervention

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

55. Registered sex offenders (RSOs) are required to notify their personal details to the police. This system is often referred to as the ‘sex offenders’ register’ and requires offenders to provide their local police station with a record of (amongst other things) their: name, address, date of birth and national insurance number. This is done annually and whenever their details change. The notification requirements are an automatic consequence of a conviction or caution for an offence in Schedule 3 to the SOA 2003, but the length of time an offender will be subject to the requirements will vary dependent upon the sentence they are given. The duration of the notification requirements (or how long a person is on the sex offenders’ register) is set out in the SOA 2003; neither the courts nor the police have discretion over this.
56. Offenders sentenced for a Schedule 3 offence to a term of imprisonment of 30 months are subject to the notification requirements indefinitely, although they may seek a review of their indefinite notification requirements after 15 years (eight years for juveniles). A review is not automatic and must – and currently can only – be applied for by the offender. A review is carried out by the police and takes into account a range of factors, including any information provided from agencies which operate within the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements framework. This ensures that there is an individual assessment of risk before any offender is considered for removal from the notification requirements.
57. The Home Office commissioned an independent report into the police’s management of sex offenders in the community in 2022, which was conducted by retired Chief Constable Mick Creedon. A summary version of his report ‘Independent review of police-led sex offender management’ was published by the Home Office in April 2023¹⁵. Creedon made recommendations to improve the consistency, efficiency, and effectiveness of the police’s management of sex offenders, such as:

¹⁵ Independent review of police-led sex offender management - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-police-led-sex-offender-management>

- a. Legislation that places the responsibility on the police to proactively consider and, if suitable, discharge RSOs' indefinite notification requirements after 15 years (or eight for juveniles).
 - b. Allowing forces to assess which details to collect and how RSOs should notify annually or whenever their details change, affording opportunities for online or remote notification where appropriate.
 - c. That notification requirements are reviewed to explore whether the current details collected are fit for purpose, considering the incorporation of additional details.
58. The proposed legislative changes respond to the abovementioned recommendations; the report contains further recommendations to the government, which it is considering, as well as law enforcement and other agencies. Additional changes are being made to the notification requirements following engagement with individual police forces and the National Police Chiefs' Council. The changes in the Crime and Policing Bill include the following:
- a) name changes are notifiable in advance and the police may place restrictions on RSOs' name changes on official documents where there is a risk a change of name will be used to enable further sexual offending;
 - b) RSOs are required to notify absences of five days or more from their home address;
 - c) the rank of police officers able to authorise warrants to enter an RSO's home to risk assess them is reduced to Inspector (SOA 2003, section 96B warrant);
 - d) child sex offenders and those without convictions for sexual offences against children but that pose a risk to children are required to notify in advance entry into a specified premises (for example, a household) where children are present; certain RSOs can notify virtually in specified circumstances;
 - e) the police can proactively review indefinite notification requirements after 15 years; and there is a new power for the Home Secretary to issue statutory guidance on disclosing information about registered sex offenders, both those who may pose a risk to children ("Sarah's Law") and more generally.
59. Measures 'b' and 'd' (absence from address and child sexual offender notification requirements) as set out in the policy options, aim to enhance the police's ability to monitor RSOs and improve levels of protection for the public. This may lead to additional breaches which will increase costs for the criminal justice system. The remaining notification requirement measures aim to improve the efficiency of the notification requirements system and generate cost savings. The change to section 96b warrants, the introduction of virtual notification requirements, and the removal of indefinite notification requirements for applicable RSOs aim to reduce the administrative burden on the police.
60. Regarding the restriction on RSOs' name changes: there is an absence of reliable data on the volumes of RSOs who change their names with the intention of reoffending by concealing criminal pasts. Engagement with the police suggests there is a cohort of RSOs recorded as 'missing' on police systems due to a failure to comply with notification requirements. However, this is likely to be a small group and an RSO's 'missing' status may not be associated with a name change¹⁶.

¹⁶ They could be recorded as missing due to other factors such as leaving the country or changing address.

61. The changes to implement restrictions on RSOs' changes of name are designed to enable the police and document issuing agencies to more closely monitor the use of name changes on official documents by high-risk offenders.
62. The disclosure of police information to prevent sexual reoffending is inconsistent across England and Wales, leaving vulnerable people at risk of sexual abuse and exploitation. Guidance for police on how best to approach the disclosure of such information is currently issued on a non-statutory basis with the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme (CSODS – "Sarah's Law"), [revised in April 2023]¹⁷. Greater consistency and adherence to guidance could be further strengthened by placing it on statutory footing thereby placing a duty on police to have regard for it.
63. These strengthened notification requirement measures in their totality aim to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the police's management of RSOs in the community. The rationale for government intervention is improved public protection, with the wider public better protected from potentially high-risk sexual offenders.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

64. Currently there is a lack of clear and consistent guidance on what stalking is, and misunderstandings within police forces over what process to follow when releasing identifying information about a stalking victim. The guidance will aim to support police and other agencies when dealing directly with stalking cases, by providing a framework to help them respond and guide them on who to work with. Additional guidance for the police when releasing identifying information of a stalker to victims will also be issued.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

65. Police forces currently have the power to address the criminal exploitation of children using various existing offences and civil orders, such as under the MSA. However, a bespoke framework would provide a more consistent response and seek to mitigate the existing evidential challenges under current legislation.
66. Police forces and safeguarding bodies have asked for a specific offence of CCE, as this would send a strong signal about the harms of CCE and could deter criminals from including children in their criminal activities. The new offence will support a more consistent response by police and support services to victims and perpetrators across England and Wales. Additionally, the offence will provide reliable national prevalence estimates through CJS statistics that will allow for a better understanding of the scale of the issue.
67. Criminal groups exploit children into criminal activity for their own benefit. CCE is used in a range of crime types including dealing/transporting drugs or weapons (for instance for County Lines gangs), cannabis cultivation, theft and acquisitive crime, fraud, and serious violence. Criminally exploited children often experience multiple forms of abuse, including violence and threats, emotional and sexual abuse, debt bondage and more. The harm caused to victims

¹⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/find-out-if-a-person-has-a-record-for-child-sexual-offences>

can be particularly damaging, including serious physical harm, long-term trauma, and entrapment in a cycle of criminalisation.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction and acquittal

68. Home Office conducted a review of SPOs in February 2022.¹⁸ This was to understand how they were working in the two full years since their implementation in January 2020. The review was not intended to be a full evaluation of SPOs rather provided insight into the use of SPOs and the application process.
69. The review highlighted positive examples of SPOs being issued. However, it also highlighted a lack of use across most police force areas, with some police officers experiencing long delays at court for an order to be granted. Due to current SPO legislation not allowing courts to issue SPOs of their own volition, the review didn't specifically explore the issue of the courts being able to make SPOs.
70. In 2022 the National Stalking Consortium submitted a super-complaint on the police response to stalking¹⁹ which highlighted how other orders, such as restraining orders which the court can make, are not suitable or often applicable to stalking victims. The super-complaint highlighted evidence showing police are often failing to consider or apply for SPOs when the victim would benefit from such protection. Given the current reliance on police to apply for SPOs, this could mean a gap whereby some victims of stalking are not receiving the best available protection.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

71. The economic and social rationale for government intervention is that, while local police forces currently attempt to address cuckooing with various approaches, a national framework is needed for a more consistent response. The government has the power to introduce primary legislation to create a cuckooing offence and develop guidance for operational stakeholders working to protect victims and target perpetrators. The new offence will improve the consistency of the response to victims and perpetrators across England and Wales. Additionally, the offence will provide more reliable national prevalence estimates through CJS statistics that will allow for a better understanding of the scale of the issue.
72. Although data on the prevalence of cuckooing is limited as it is not yet classified as an offence, recent reports indicate that cuckooing cases in England and Wales are increasing. A 2023 Centre for Social Justice report²⁰ found that one in eight of people surveyed had noticed signs of cuckooing in their local communities, while the 2023 London Labour report²¹ documented a 300 per cent increase in cuckooing in London between 2018 and 2022. The narrative of an

¹⁸ Review of Stalking Protection Orders (accessible version). Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/management-information-stalking-protection-orders/review-of-stalking-protection-orders-accessible-version>

¹⁹ Super-complaint on the police response to stalking (suzylampugh.org). Available here: <https://www.suzylampugh.org/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=cf3fdc8b-f958-4cc0-9fc7-9ce6de3e9137>

²⁰ Centre for Social Justice Report– Slavery at Home. Available here: <https://justiceandcare.org/app/uploads/2023/02/Slavery-at-Home-a-new-bill-to-tackle-slavery-in-Britain.pdf>

²¹ London Labour Report - Protecting the Vulnerable: Addressing "Cuckooing" in London. Available here: <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-05/Cuckooing%20Report%20Embargoed.pdf>

increasing prevalence in cuckooing cases has been supported by individual police forces who were consulted in relation to this legislation.

73. Cuckooing causes significant harm to victims by violating the safety and security of their homes, exposing them to, and sometimes involving them in, criminality and subjecting them to tactics including deception, manipulation, coercion, fear, and violence. Cuckooing also has a wider impact on communities by facilitating criminal activity, in particular drug dealing, which can lead to anti-social behaviour.
74. Police and partners have existing tools and powers to deal with the criminal activity associated with cuckooing and can take action to evict cuckooing perpetrators from premises through the use of Closure Orders. However, there is no legislation which specifically holds offenders to account for the harm caused by taking over another person's home for the purposes of criminality.
75. As a result, victims of cuckooing are often not recognised as such by professionals or wider society. This impacts victims' ability to receive protection and support and to get redress for the harm caused to them. Similarly, there is no clear message to perpetrators of cuckooing that this specific practice is not tolerated by society.
76. Introducing a new offence of cuckooing would complement the new offence for CCE given that anecdotal evidence from police and partners suggests that children exploited by county lines gangs are sent to cuckooed properties where they are likely to be subjected to violence and intimidation. Increased enforcement against cuckooing would help to safeguard victims of CCE, supporting the government's Safer Streets Mission.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

77. AI, digital imagery, and online platforms are being increasingly used to create and share CSA imagery. Pseudo and AI-generated images often depict the most severe and graphic forms of CSA and can be used to generate abuse images of "real" children. These seek to normalise the sexual abuse of children and increase the volume of CSAM available. Repeat traumatisation occurs every time a photo of a "real" child is shared online.
78. These measures were developed following operational reporting outlining the ways in which CSA offenders were using AI during their offending and following a rapid evaluation of criminal law. They were developed via the Home Office run CSA Legislation Working Group, which provides a forum for law enforcement partners to flag potential gaps in the legislation for consideration. The group includes representation from the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) who advise whether current criminal law covers the scenarios set out. Subject matter expertise from organisations such as the Internet Watch Foundation was also sought whilst developing the AI clauses.
79. These measures are designed to keep legislation up to date with the changing nature of online CSA and prevent the creation and redistribution of images. Specifically:
 - The possession of a tool (CSA Image Generator) which is used for the sole purpose of creating CSAM (which is itself an offence to produce, possess or distribute) is currently not criminal. This measure seeks to solve this by criminalising the possession of a CSA Image Generator.
 - Current legislation criminalising the possession of a paedophile manual does not extend to AI paedophile manuals. The National Crime Agency (NCA) have detected an

AI paedophile manual in circulation, and the prevalence of these is expected to grow alongside AI generated and pseudo-images of children. This measure seeks to close this legislative gap by extending the existing paedophile manual offence to include AI paedophile manuals.

- Offenders use electronic services such as closed forums, dark web servers or invite-only messaging groups to share CSAM and network with other offenders. There is no specific offence related to providing or maintaining an electronic service which facilitates the production or distribution of CSAM. The CPS has flagged the lack of a specific offence as a risk. Offenders are being charged with a variety of semi-relevant offences, such as possession of indecent images of children, participation in a serious organised crime group, and arranging and facilitating the sexual exploitation of a child. These could be subject to challenge. This measure provides a specific offence and a maximum penalty reflective of the severity of their crimes.
- Border Force officers searching an individual believed to be in possession of CSAM currently have no coercive power to require the disclosure of a password to unlock a digital device. If a passenger withholds the password, the suspect must be allowed on their way. This measure aims to update existing Border Force powers with equivalent digital search powers by bringing the refusal to provide the digital access key/code under the existing offence of Obstruction of a Revenue or Customs Officer.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

80. The final report of IICSA made the following recommendation: that the UK government enables any person engaging an individual to work or volunteer with children on a frequent basis to check whether or not they have been barred by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) from working with children. These arrangements should also apply where the role is undertaken on a supervised basis.
81. The inquiry was concerned that the supervision exemption poses a safeguarding risk by allowing those who may be barred to work closely and frequently with children, if considered subject to day-to-day supervision. IICSA also found that the exemption adds unhelpful complexity to the definition of RA, which employers need to understand when assessing not only the eligibility of particular roles for the highest level of DBS check but also their duties, if regulated activity providers for the work being undertaken with children.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

82. The overarching rationale for the sentencing measures detailed in the Crime and Policing Bill is one of equity. The measures outlined here propose reform to the sentencing framework that should provide greater public protection (including supporting the government's mission to 'tackle' violence against women and girls); make sure that the options available to the courts reflect the seriousness of the offences committed and reflect the impact of the crime; provide victims with a sense that justice has been delivered; and increase public confidence in sentencing.
83. In recent years, there have been a number of high-profile prosecutions of grooming gangs, including in Rotherham, Telford, Newcastle, Rochdale and Oxford. In 2014, the Independent

Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997 to 2013 identified that at least 1,400 children and young people in Rotherham had been sexually abused or exploited.²²

84. In January 2025 the Home Secretary announced that the government would legislate to make grooming a statutory aggravating factor in the sentencing of child sexual offences. An aggravating factor makes an offence more serious, potentially leading to a sentence uplift, and must be considered by the court in deciding the length of a sentence.
85. This new statutory aggravating factor should enable courts to reflect the seriousness of grooming behaviour, including by grooming gangs' members. It will capture offenders who demonstrate grooming behaviours in connection to sexual offences against those under 18 and those who knowingly take advantage of children who they know to have been groomed by others. An aggravating factor makes an offence more serious and is taken into account by the court when deciding the length of a sentence.

D. Appraisal

General assumptions for all measures:

86. The following general assumptions are used in this EN which is in line with the guidance set out in HM Treasury (2022) Green Book²³:
 - a. The appraisal period used is 10 years, 2025/26 to 2034/35.
 - b. The price base year used is FY 2025/26.
 - c. The present value base year is FY 2025/26.
 - d. The HM Treasury GDP deflator, 2024²⁴

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

General Assumptions and Volume Estimates from Data

General assumptions

87. Transition costs are presented in the 2026/27 financial year as this is the expected point of implementation.
88. The effects of Option 1 are modelled relative to the counterfactual 'Do nothing'²⁵ baseline, which has zero costs and benefits by definition.
89. Optimism Bias of 20 per cent is applied to specific costs within the analysis to account for uncertainty in those estimates. This includes court costs (following MoJ advice of a potential underestimation of unit costs), ongoing prison costs and various wage costs used across the analysis (as a national average is used).

²² <https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/279/independent-inquiry-into-child-sexual-exploitation-in-rotherham>

²³ HMT Green Book, 2022. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/Government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-Government/the-green-book-2020>

²⁴ GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk): <https://www.gov.uk/Government/collections/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp>

²⁵ 'Do nothing' means doing nothing additional to the actions already being taken (such as communications, new guidance for police and prosecutors, and new funding).

90. The cost of a prison place is derived from internal MoJ analysis.

Estimating the impact on volume of breaches

91. To estimate the total number of RSOs in England and Wales who would breach the reformed absence from address measure, adjacent data on the number of RSOs that have breached this notification requirement in Northern Ireland²⁶ has been scaled up. Data acquired from Northern Ireland Police was used, with sensitivity analysis applied, and scaled up using the ratio of RSOs in Northern Ireland compared to England and Wales in 2023/24²⁷. The corresponding Northern Ireland legislation requires notification for a three-day absence from a recorded address, whereas the new measure in England and Wales will require notification pending a five-day absence. A 60 per cent assumption has been applied to the estimated number of breaches to account for this discrepancy.
92. The estimated number of breaches per year in England and Wales ranges between 64 and 193, with a central estimate of 129 breaches. The analysis assumes volumes remain constant throughout the 10-year appraisal period as there is a lack of long-term data available to generate variance. These breach figures have been used to estimate the subsequent court, legal aid, and prison costs.
93. RSOs sentenced to 30 plus months of full immediate custody are currently required to comply with indefinite notification requirements with a minimum duration of 15 years (or eight years for juveniles) post-release. The proportion of RSOs sentenced to three plus years in immediate custody is 58 per cent²⁸; the analysis assumes that these RSOs are eligible to have requirements removed after the 15-year statutory waiting period (2025/26 as the first year of appraisal).
94. There is an application process in place for RSOs to have their indefinite requirements removed. Between 2016 and 2018, 72 per cent of applications to remove indefinite requirements were approved²⁹. This figure is used as the central estimate to determine how many RSOs will have their indefinite requirements removed (62 per cent as the low estimate and 82 per cent as the high estimate).
95. The number of RSOs that inadvertently breach their notification requirements is estimated to reduce as more offenders are taken off indefinite requirements, relieving pressure on offender managers and the wider CJS. Internal MoJ figures for the number of RSOs released from custody (2017 to 2023) show a 0.53 per cent annual growth rate. This is used to generate RSO release estimates back to 2009 to account for the 15-year statutory requirement period.
96. The marginal propensity of an RSO to breach notification requirements is calculated to determine the number of breaches avoided within the cohort of eligible RSOs per year. This figure estimates the likelihood of an RSO to breach notification requirements and the effect of this measure on the CJS. In the year ending June 2024, there were 2,270 convictions³⁰ for a

²⁶ Provided by colleagues from the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)

²⁷ GOV.UK (2024). Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) annual: 2023 to 2024. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-mappa-annual-2023-to-2024>

²⁸ Ministry of Justice (2023). Criminal Justice Statistics Quarterly. Due to an absence in granular MoJ data the three plus years bracket has been used as a proxy for 30 plus months. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

²⁹ According to the 2023 'Independent review of police-led sex offender management' report commissioned by Mick Creedon: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-police-led-sex-offender-management>

³⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

breach of RSO notification requirements processed through the CJS³¹. The number of Category 1 RSOs in the community (70,052)³² is divided by the number of convictions to generate a marginal propensity to breach rate of 3.24 per cent.

97. To calculate the number of breaches avoided per year, the 3.24 per cent assumption is applied to the total number of eligible RSOs on indefinite notification requirements. In 2025/26, the central estimate of number of breaches avoided is 73. These figures are expected to rise slightly throughout the appraisal period due to the 0.53 per cent annual growth rate in RSO releases.

Estimating the volume of “missing” registered sex offenders who changed their name

98. This section of the analysis aims to estimate the total number of ‘missing’ RSOs due to changing their name. These RSOs are assumed to be deliberately avoiding detection by the authorities and are in scope of the legislation and subsequent criminal proceedings.
99. Recently published (2023/24) multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) data shows that there were 70,052³³ known RSOs living in the community within England and Wales over the financial year ending 31 March 2023. This is scaled up by five per cent per year to give an estimated number of 77,124 RSOs in 2025/26. The five per cent average annual increase assumption is based on growth rates of the RSO cohort from the previous ten years of published data.
100. There is no centrally available data on volumes of RSOs that are “missing” due to a name change. RSOs may be recorded as “missing” due to other factors, such as leaving the country or changing address. To estimate this it is assumed, based on engagement with police, the same proportion of the missing RSO population will change their name as the general RSO population who notify of a name change. Projections for this number of missing RSOs are set out below.
101. The percentage of RSOs who notified the police of a name change is estimated using data from 17 police force areas, from a Freedom of Information Act 2000 request using data from 2021/22³⁴. Using the volumes of RSOs who notified of a name change, it is estimated that 1.1 per cent of total RSOs within the Freedom of Information (FOI) request notify a name change annually.
102. This percentage is applied³⁵ to the estimates of “missing” RSOs. The high estimate (729 RSOs) uses the number of RSOs that have either been recorded by police as missing or wanted for arrest in the past three financial years according to an FOI from the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)³⁶. The low estimate (104 RSOs) is estimated using the number of Category 1 RSOs that breached the notification requirement during 2023/24³⁷, less

³¹ The analysis assumes that each individual conviction for a breach of notification requirements is a different RSO.

³² GOV.UK (2024). Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) annual: 2023 to 2024. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-mappa-annual-2023-to-2024>

³³ GOV.UK (2024). Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) annual: 2023 to 2024. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-mappa-annual-2023-to-2024>

³⁴ BBC Shared Data Unit (2023), Sex offender name changes. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-64624921>

³⁵ Following engagement with Police colleagues to test this assumption.

³⁶ BBC Shared Data Unit (2023), Sex offender name changes. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-64624921>

³⁷ GOV.UK (2024). Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) annual: 2023 to 2024. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-mappa-annual-2023-to-2024>

of those that were sentenced to custodial and non-custodial sentences in the year ending June 2023³⁸. The central estimate (417 RSOs) is calculated by the central value of these estimates.

103. This analysis has produced a low estimate of the number of “missing” RSOs that change their name annually following the RSO name change notice intervention of one, a central estimate of five and a high estimate of eight.

Sensitivity analysis due to volume uncertainty

104. Stakeholder engagement with police has led to the inclusion of additional sensitivity analysis for the volume of RSOs in scope of the name change legislation as there is uncertainty over the potential impact of the policy. The sensitivity analysis is applied to the following cost categories; impacts on the police, HMPO, and the DVLA. The wide sensitivity analysis highlights the uncertainty of the volume projections used within the analysis.
105. **Tables 2 and 3** show the range assumed for the number of additional RSOs in scope of the legislation per year, and the number of RSOs assumed to apply for a name change per year. The high estimate is the estimated additional RSOs per year using the five per cent annual growth rate. The low estimate applies the 1.1 per cent name change assumption mentioned in previous section. The central estimate is calculated using the proportion of high/very high-risk offenders compared to the overall cohort of RSOs, volumes have been excluded from the appraisal due to data sensitivity issues. The high estimate is calculated using the total number of additional RSOs per year according to the five per cent annual growth rate assumption.

Table 2: Number of additional RSOs in scope per year

	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35
Low	39	41	43	46	48	50	53	55	58	61
High	3,621	3,800	3,987	4,183	4,389	4,606	4,832	5,071	5,320	5,582

Source: Home Office internal analysis

Table 3: Number of additional RSOs estimated to notify of a name change application per year

	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35
Low	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13	13	14
High	839	880	923	969	1,017	1,067	1,119	1,174	1,232	1,293

Source: Home Office internal analysis

COSTS

Monetised costs: Set-up costs

Cost 1: Familiarisation costs

106. The police and probation service will need familiarisation with the new legislation and guidance. Legislation length estimates fall between 3,348 and 17,630 words with a central

³⁸ Ministry of Justice (2023). Quarterly statistics on the Criminal Justice System. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2023>

point of 10,489 based on existing documents³⁹. It is estimated between two and four inspectors per police force will be required to read the guidance, which will be in digital format. The time taken to read the guidance is estimated to range between 5 and 124 minutes, with a central estimate of 42 minutes^{40, 41}. The average hourly wage across England and Wales for the inspector rank is £52.08 (2025/26 prices), whereas the corresponding hourly rate for a senior prison officer (used as a proxy for an offender manager) is £37.08⁴². These figures incorporate additional 'on-costs' for example, pension and National Insurance contributions.

³⁹ Low estimate taken from College of Policing (2020), Notification requirements. Available at: Notification requirements | College of Policing Legislation: <https://www.college.police.uk/app/major-investigation-and-public-protection/managing-sexual-offenders-and-violent-offenders/notification-requirements>, High estimate taken from Sexual Offences Act 2003. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/42>

⁴⁰ Calculated using the Readingsoft calculator: <http://www.readingsoft.com/>

⁴¹ The move to place existing guidance on a statutory footing, as applied to CSODs is calculated to be negligible as the measure will apply to a scheme with which the police are already familiar and with revised non-statutory CSODS guidance being published in April 2023.

⁴² Data taken from the Earnings and hours worked, occupation by four-digit SOC: ASHE Table 14 - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk): <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/occupation4digit2010ashtable14>

107. Costs are estimated as:

time taken to read legislation x wage rate x volume of people reading

108. Legislation familiarisation costs for both the police and probation service are **estimated to range between £6,000 and £330,000, with a central estimate of £83,000.**
109. For the statutory guidance measure (which is anticipated to cover published CSODs guidance in the immediate term) a small, one-off training and familiarisation cost could be incurred by the police if volumes increased considerably. This cost is assumed to be negligible as the measure will apply to a scheme with which the police are already familiar. The publication of statutory guidance for additional information disclosure schemes to prevent sexual offending against other victims or in different contexts will incur further cost, which will be considered in any scheme's development.

Cost 2: Prison place costs

110. The absence from address measure is assumed to increase the number of prison places required across the prison estate. Prison place impact is calculated by multiplying the estimated number of custodial sentences per year by the Average Custodial Sentence Length (ACSL) served in years. For most offences, an offender will only serve half their sentence prior to release on licence unless certain conditions are attached⁴³. This 50 per cent time-served assumption has been incorporated into the analysis. The projected annual prison place impact is estimated to range between 4 and 23, with a central estimate of 11.
111. The immediate custody rate for a breach of notification requirements is 36 per cent⁴⁴. This figure is applied to all CJS impacts to account for technical or inadvertent breaches. The assumption ensures that only the most significant breaches are captured by the modelling. The 36 per cent figure is retained as the central assumption, whereas 25 per cent is used in the low scenario and 50 per cent is used in the high scenario.
112. To account for current low prison capacity, an internal set up unit cost⁴⁵ per prison place is estimated to account for the creation of a new prison place. An optimism bias rate of 20 per cent has been applied to this unit cost to account for uncertainty. The unit cost is multiplied by the prison place impact projections. The prison set-up costs from the measures are **estimated to range between £2.4 million and £18.5 million, with a central estimate of £7.0 million.**

Cost 3: DVLA costs

113. The DVLA will be required to absorb transition costs to ensure their current RSO tracking capabilities are in line with the potential scope of the name change legislation. This will include applying markers to driver's license holders in England and Wales, plus generating further records for those without a license. The initial identity checks are implemented when a provisional license is issued.
114. The proportion of RSOs who hold a driver's license in England and Wales is currently unknown due to a lack of comprehensive data. The analysis uses the proportion of people above the

⁴³ The main exceptions to the 50 per cent custody assumption are offenders sentenced under extended sentencing provisions or those on indeterminate sentences for example, life.

⁴⁴ Ministry of Justice (2024). Quarterly statistics on the Criminal Justice System. This is an average taken from the last five years of data. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

⁴⁵ Ministry of Justice (2024), Internal estimate provided by Ministry of Justice, 2024.

age of 17 within England who hold a full driver's license as a proxy. According to recent GOV.UK data, 75 per cent⁴⁶ of people aged 17+ within England held a license (2022 estimate). This analysis will monetise the total number of assumed RSOs in the year 2026/27 (80,924) by the valuation of time via wage rates.

115. The estimates use the national average hourly wage uplifted for non-wage costs and optimism bias, rate of £25.86⁴⁷. The 20 per cent optimism bias rate is used to reflect the uncertainty associated with using a national average. The total set-up costs for the DVLA are **estimated to range between £19 and £300,000 with a central estimate of £90,000.**

Cost 4: Police application processing costs Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme)

116. The measure seeks to create a power for the Home Secretary to issue statutory guidance regarding the disclosure of police information to prevent sexual offending. The estimated costs of introducing such a power are adjudged to be negligible and not costed.
117. However, following anticipated press coverage around the Crime and Policing Bill and specifically areas around sex offender notifications, a small cost could be expected as a result of a short-term spike in CSODS applications. Based on data following the publication of revised CSODS guidance and subsequent media coverage in 2023 a projected spike of between 11 per cent to 21 per cent has been used to estimate increased demand on police time in responding to requests for information.
118. Unit costs for dealing with applications have been used as follows: £172 for each application made about a subject where there is no information to suggest they pose a risk to children; £254 per application where there is information to suggest they pose a risk of sexual harm to children, but no disclosure of information is made; and £372 for each application that results in a disclosure. The Home Office have assumed no change in the proportion of applications that result in a disclosure. Multiplying the change in use by the cost to police gives an additional set-up cost of between **£49,000 and £96,000, with a central estimate of £72,000.**

Total Set-up costs

119. In total, the set-up costs are **estimated to range between £2.4 million and £19.3 million with a central estimate of £7.3 million.**

⁴⁶ National Travel Survey 2022: Factsheet (accessible) - GOV.UK: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

⁴⁷ Data taken from the Earnings and hours worked, occupation by four-digit SOC: ASHE Table 14 - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk): <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/occupation4digit2010ashtable14>

Monetised costs: Ongoing costs

Cost 4: Prison costs

120. The MoJ have developed an internal estimate for the annual cost of a prison place. This figure updated to 2025/26 prices with a 20 per cent optimism bias rate applied⁴⁸. This unit cost is multiplied by the relevant prison place impact figures.
121. The ongoing prison costs **are estimated to range between £1.9 million and £14.8 million, with a central estimate of £5.6 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 5: Court costs

122. The MoJ have developed internal estimates for the cost of sexual offence cases that are processed through the Magistrates and Crown Courts. Both figures have been updated from 2023/24 prices to the 2025/26 price year, with a 20 per cent optimism bias rate applied⁴⁹. MoJ statistics show that 76 per cent of RSO notification requirement breaches are processed through the Magistrates' Court, with the remaining 24 per cent of cases through the Crown Court⁵⁰. The unit cost figures are multiplied by the number of additional breaches as a result of the measures. The sensitivity analysis used to account for unreported and technical breaches of notices is applied to the number of breaches to determine the number of cases processed through the CJS.
123. The ongoing court costs are **estimated to range between £0.3 million and £1.9 million, with a central estimate of £0.9 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 6: Legal aid costs

124. The MoJ hold internal unit cost figures for legal aid provision per case processed through the CJS. The MoJ have developed eligibility assumptions for both courts; 50 per cent of defendants will be eligible for legal aid in the Magistrates' Court and 100 per cent will be eligible for support in the Crown Court. Optimism bias is not applied to the legal aid unit costs as per MoJ advice. The unit costs are multiplied by the number of additional breaches as a result of the measures. The estimated breaches assume the same volumes as in the court costs.
125. The ongoing legal aid costs are **estimated to range between £0.4 million and £2.2 million, with a central estimate of £1.1 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 7: Police costs

126. This legislation will confer a power on the police to issue a notice to RSOs who they consider pose a risk in relation to name change which mandates that the RSO must seek approval from the police before a name change. The police will then use their discretion to approve or deny any requests from that RSO for a name change on official documentation. This means that offender managers will now have to review the evidence and potentially interview RSOs to determine name change risk. As there is no data on the number of offender managers in

⁴⁸ The 20 per cent optimism bias is after engagement with Ministry of Justice colleagues. There is uncertainty surrounding the prison ongoing unit costs, the optimism bias mitigates the risk of cost underestimation.

⁴⁹ The 20 per cent optimism rate has been applied after engagement with the MoJ due to uncertainty over the estimate.

⁵⁰ Criminal Justice System statistics quarterly: December 2023 - GOV.UK:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

England and Wales, an assumption of a ratio of 50:1 RSOs to offender managers has been applied to the volume of Category 1 RSOs.

127. The total amount of resource the police use to decide on all RSO name change applications will depend on the volume in scope. This is set out by Table 3 in the volumes data section, which shows the number of additional RSOs assumed to apply for a name change per year. The overall costs will be calculated using the following formula:

*(Wage of offender manager x central assumption) *Volume of name change applications in scope.*

128. The intention of the statutory guidance measure related to CSOD is to improve consistency in police application of an existing scheme offered by all forces in England and Wales, so there are unlikely to be any significant monetised ongoing costs.
129. Ongoing police costs are **estimated to range between £10,000 and £1.0 million with a central estimate of £0.3 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 8: HMPO costs

130. HMPO are also assumed to incur ongoing costs as per the DVLA. HMPO will be expected to review the name change applications they receive per year. HMPO are assumed to incur ongoing costs due to the need to process the additional RSOs who are given a notice by the police each year. Future projections have been generated via the assumption of a 5 per cent annual increase in the overall volume of RSOs in England and Wales, which is set out in **Table 2.**
131. The ongoing costs for HMPO are **estimated to range between £5,000 and £0.4 million with a central estimate of £0.1 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 9: DVLA costs

132. The DVLA are expected to incur ongoing costs due to the need to process the additional RSOs who are given a notice each year. This includes applying the markers to license holders and creating records for non-license holders. The DVLA will also be expected to notify the police when an RSO makes a name change application. This administrative task is assumed to take the same amount of time as the markers and records for non-license holders in England and Wales.
133. The overall ongoing costs for the DVLA are **estimated to range between £3,000 and £0.3 million with a central estimate of £80,000 (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Cost 10: Probation Costs

134. The MoJ have developed internal estimates for the monthly unit cost of probation for offenders released from immediate custody. The figures (given in 2023/24 prices) have been uprated to 2025/26 prices with a 20 per cent optimism bias rate applied. The unit cost figure is multiplied by the number of additional breaches derived from the absence from address measure that result in immediate custody. This figure is multiplied by the ACSL and the average probation length assumption.⁵¹
135. The overall ongoing probation costs are **estimated to range between £0.2 million and £1.2 million with a central estimate of £0.6 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

⁵¹ It is assumed that the probation length of those released from immediate custody will be 50 per cent of the ACSL.

Total Ongoing costs

136. Total ongoing costs across all measures are **estimated to range between £2.8 million and £21.8 million, with a central estimate of £8.7 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Non-monetised costs:

Cost 1: HMPO, Migrations and Borders costs

137. HMPO currently employ a tracking system for public protection purposes, including for name changes by RSOs to limit evasion capabilities. This tracking system may need to be scaled up depending on the scope of the measure and how many RSOs will be affected. This may incur significant staff costs and require additional resource for HMPO, but it has not yet been possible to monetise these additional costs.

Cost 2: DVLA Costs

138. The DVLA will also be required to accommodate for an increased level of administration due to the introduction of this legislation. The opportunity cost of this increased administrative burden is the potential influence on other DVLA services. Additionally, the DVLA will be expected to add details of prospective exemptions to RSO records where applicable.

139. The Department currently does not have any data on the proportion of cases in which an exemption may apply. At this stage, the process of handling an exception is non-monetised due to the lack of clarity on how handling exemptions would work, yet it is assumed to add to the DVLA administrative burden.

Cost 3: Costs of appeals to the Criminal Justice System

140. There will be a right of appeal against a denial of a name change by the police, which will be made to the Magistrates' Court. The right of appeal will exist both for (a) the issuance of a notice by the police and (b) the denial of a name change on official documents by an RSO who has received a notice.

141. The Magistrates' Court unit cost of £874 (provided by MoJ) has been used to give an indication of what the scale of appeal costs could be. However, with a lack of evidence surrounding the likelihood of appeals resulting from this legislation, this scenario modelling carries significant uncertainty and have not been included in the NSPV figures.

Cost 4: Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme statutory guidance costs

142. This policy seeks to improve consistency in police application of an existing scheme offered by all forces in England and Wales, so there are unlikely to be any significant non-monetised ongoing costs.

Total Costs

143. Total costs across all monetised set up and ongoing costs across both sets of interventions are **estimated to range between £5.2 million and £41.1 million, with a central estimate of £15.9 million over the 10-year appraisal period.**

144. The wide range in the costs estimates is due to sensitivity analysis used to account for uncertainty in the conversion of Northern Ireland to England and Wales RSO data. Another leading factor is the sensitivity analysis used to account for technical and unreported breaches of notification requirements. There is additional uncertainty in the custodial sentence length and the estimation in number of RSOs which break the name change ban.

145. It is important to note there are a number of substantial non-monetised costs associated with these reform measures that are not included in the Net Present Social Value (NPSV) estimates. In relation to the name-change ban reforms the total figures lack data, such as staff time and IT infrastructure costs that would result to agencies producing Identity documents, including DVLA, HMPO and Immigration Offices. When assessing total costs, it is important that these significant non-monetised costs are considered in conjunction with the monetised costs.

BENEFITS

Monetised benefits: Set-up benefits

146. It has not been possible to monetise many set-up benefits related to the interventions, because of a lack of existing data or literature regarding the specific further offences that an RSO who currently breaches the notification requirement goes on to commit.

Benefit 1: Prison cost savings

147. The indefinite requirements measure is assumed to generate cost savings for the prison system as a result of reduced inadvertent notification requirement breaches. For those given an immediate custodial sentence, the offender is likely to only serve half their sentence prior to release on licence unless certain conditions are attached⁵².

148. The same sensitivity analysis rates are used to account for the technical and unreported breaches of notification requirements. The number of modelled additional breaches is multiplied by the 50 per cent custody assumption and the sensitivity analysis is used to generate a range for the prison place impact of this measure, which is assumed to grow slightly throughout the appraisal period due to the annual RSO release rate of 0.53 per cent⁵³.

Table 4: Projected annual Prison Place Impact reduction of the indefinite requirements measure

PPI	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35
-----	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

⁵² The main exceptions to the 50 per cent custody assumption are offenders sentenced under extended sentencing provisions or those on indeterminate sentences for example, life.

⁵³ This is based on official-sensitive MoJ RSO release data.

Low	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Central	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7
High	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	11	11

Source: Home Office internal analysis

149. The unit cost for an additional prison place is an internal MoJ figure. The prison set-up cost savings are **estimated to range between £2.3 million and £6.0 million, with a central estimate of £3.8 million.** These figures represent total set-up cost savings for the new measures.

Monetised benefits: Ongoing benefits

Benefit 2: Police efficiency savings

150. The measure to shift the responsibility of processing a SOA 2003, section 96B warrant⁵⁴ from superintendent to inspector is modelled to generate efficiencies in the form of time and cost savings. According to internal HMCTS data, **150 section 96B warrants** were processed between 2018 and 2023, with an average of 25 warrants per year. The salaries of both inspectors and superintendents in 2025/26 prices are derived from internal Home Office analysis on police pay-scales⁵⁵. The average weighted salary is taken from across England and Wales. These salaries have been converted to wage per hour figures, with additional non-costs to account for public sector national insurance and pension contributions.
151. Stakeholder engagement with police colleagues highlighted significant time savings for the section 96B warrant process under the new measure. The process is estimated to only take 30 minutes per warrant after this legislation is introduced, whereas this currently takes between 4 and 6 hours⁵⁶.
152. Under previous legislation, the superintendent would be required to attend court in person to obtain the warrant, which needs to be balanced with alternative commitments. The change will allow inspector authorisation, and an officer of any rank will be permitted to attend court and obtain the warrant. As a result, a time saving is achieved as more officers will be readily available to obtain warrants without significant delays. Both the time and wage savings will reduce the administrative burden for police forces across England and Wales.
153. The new SOA 2003, section 96B warrant measure is estimated to generate cost savings of **between £13,000 and £20,000, with a central estimate of £16,000 over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Benefit 3: Ongoing prison cost savings

154. The MoJ unit cost for an annual prison place is multiplied by the prison place impact from the indefinite requirements measure projections set out in **Table 3**. These calculations generate estimates for the costs avoided due to a reduction in the number of notification requirement breaches that are processed through the CJS.

⁵⁴ The section 96B warrant gives the police permission to enter an RSOs home to conduct a search of the premises if they are deemed to be high-risk individuals.

⁵⁵ These figures were generated by internal Home Office analysis on employee pay-scales. One key risk with these figures is that they represent national pay scales and don't take a potential London weighting for certain officers into account. This may lead to a slight underestimation of cost savings.

⁵⁶ This range will form the sensitivity analysis in the modelling.

155. The potential cost savings in the form of reduced ongoing prison costs are estimated to **range between £1.9 million and £5.0 million, with a central estimate of £3.2 million over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Benefit 4: Court cost savings

156. The MoJ unit costs for both the magistrates' and Crown Courts have been used to determine the court cost savings derived from the reformed indefinite requirements system. The assumptions for court case distribution⁵⁷ are used to approximate the potential savings to the CJS. The sensitivity analysis assumptions to account for technical and unreported breaches have also been applied.
157. The relevant unit costs are multiplied by projected reduction in the number of breaches due to the indefinite notification requirement reforms. The measure is estimated to generate potential cost savings of **between £0.3 million and £0.8 million, with a central estimate of £0.5 million.**

Benefit 5: Legal aid cost savings

158. The same MoJ unit costs for both the magistrates' and Crown Courts have been used to determine the projected legal aid cost savings due to the modelled reduction in notification requirement breaches. The eligibility assumptions for the respective courts have been applied to the projected reduction in breaches.
159. The indefinite requirements measure is assumed to generate cost savings in the form of reduced legal aid fees; the analysis shows that cost savings will range between **£0.3 million and £0.9 million, with a central estimate of £0.6 million.**

Benefit 6: Probation cost savings

160. The MoJ unit cost estimate for probation has been used to determine the projected probation cost savings resulting from a reduction in breaches caused by the indefinite requirements measure. The measure is estimated to generate a potential cost saving ranging **between £0.2 million and £0.5 million with a central estimate of £0.3 million.**

Benefit 7: Name change ban breakeven analysis

161. It has not been possible to monetise benefits related to the name change restriction, because of a lack of existing data or literature regarding the specific further offences that an RSO who currently breaches the notification requirement goes on to commit. Instead, breakeven analysis and non-monetised benefits are presented to show the benefit to society of enforcing a name change ban for RSOs.
162. Separate breakeven analyses have been conducted to assess the number of rape offences or sexual offences which would have to be prevented to offset the costs of the intervention and provide a positive net present value. Both projections for the breakeven analysis use unit cost estimates from the Economic and Social Cost of Crime Report (ESCC)⁵⁸ to indicate the economic benefit of preventing a single crime. The updated unit cost for rape is estimated at

⁵⁷ 76 per cent of cases will be processed in the Magistrates' Court, with the remaining 24 per cent processed in the Crown Court.

⁵⁸ GOV.UK (2018). The economic and social costs of crime, second edition. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5b684f22e5274a14f45342c9/the-economic-and-social-costs-of-crime-horr99.pdf>

£53,316 (2025/26 prices) whilst the updated unit cost for other sexual offences is estimated at £8,832 (2025/26 prices).

163. If the costs remained constant as the number of crimes decreased, there would need to be 26 rape offences prevented or 158 sexual offences prevented across the 10-year appraisal period to break even. However, as more crimes are prevented over time, the total costs will decrease leading to fewer crimes needing to be prevented to offset the true costs of the intervention.
164. Using the estimate of between one and eight RSOs that will be prevented from changing their name with a central estimate of five, the number of offences needed to be prevented per RSO can be estimated. There would need to be **between 3 and 23 rape offences prevented, with a central estimate of 6** to break even the cost of the name-change ban reforms. Alternatively, there would need to be **between 20 and 140 sexual offences prevented, with a central estimate of 35** to offset the cost of the name-change ban intervention.

Non-monetised benefits

Benefit 8: Improved public protection from sexual harm

165. The improved notification requirements for RSOs who pose a risk to children will allow the police to monitor these RSOs more effectively. This will aim to increase feelings of safety for children and reduce their risk of sexual harm from this cohort of RSOs. Between 2017 and 2022, 35 per cent of all sexual offences in England and Wales were committed against children⁵⁹. These figures show that a significant proportion of RSOs offend against children and this measure is needed to ensure that potential victims are protected. Increased awareness of this RSO cohort's movements will aim to prevent sexual offences against children and reduce levels of reoffending.
166. The name change restriction policy aims to reduce the ability for RSOs to reoffend as they are less able to use a name change to gain access to vulnerable members of society. This ensures the safety and well-being of potential victims and supports rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders into society. Lower sexual reoffending also improves the confidence in the CJS, encouraging reporting and facilitating effective law enforcement.
167. The purpose of Sarah's Law (CSODS) is to increase public protection and afford potential victims of child sexual abuse better protection by helping those responsible for them make a more informed decision on whether to allow that contact to continue. Through placing CSODS on a statutory footing, the consistency of police application of the scheme can be improved to provide greater protection to potential victims of child sexual abuse.

Benefit 9: Virtual notification requirements efficiencies

168. The introduction of the discretionary virtual notification requirements aims to improve the equity of the system in place. Potentially vulnerable offenders with protected characteristics who struggle to notify the police in person (as the existing legislation requires) will be given the opportunity to do so virtually. Virtual notifications will reduce the demand for police resource and allow staff to work on other competing priorities. The virtual notification process is not assumed to lead to any additional costs for the police as this will be absorbed into current spend programmes.

⁵⁹ These figures were taken from the MoJ outcomes by offence data tool. A five-year average was taken between 2018 and 2022. Available here: Criminal Justice System statistics quarterly: June 2023 - GOV.UK: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2023>

169. Home Office has provided funding for the purchase of equipment and software to prevent online based sexual offending to police forces across England and Wales via the NPCC Advanced Tools for Offender Managers (ATOM) Programmes⁶⁰. Offenders will also be able to stick to their routines and their employment will no longer be interrupted by the administrative notification requirements, which may bring benefits in terms of rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

Benefit 10: Sexual Offences Act 2003, section 96B warrant efficiencies

170. The transfer of responsibility for section 96B warrants from superintendents to inspectors will generate efficiencies for the police. This will ensure process consistency for police as the majority of other similar warrants are processed by inspectors. Superintendents will now have more resource to work on other competing priorities, including custody extensions, strategic objectives, and critical incidents within their police forces.

171. As there is a finite number of Superintendents, the section 96B warrant and subsequent search of an RSO's address takes an extended period of time to be processed. The increased availability of inspectors will aim to ensure high-risk addresses can be searched more readily. This aims to reduce risk to the public by allowing offender managers to respond more efficiently to potential risk and authorise section 96B warrants.

⁶⁰ Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk): <https://democracy.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/documents/s25276/GM%20Deputy%20Mayor%20Decision%20notice%20ATOM%20Funding%20Cumbria%20PCC%20drawn%20down%20Feb%202023%20signed%20SW%202.3.23.pdf>

Benefit 11: A more comprehensive offender management system

172. The name change restriction and the operationalisation of it by the updating of systems across agencies responsible for identity documents aim to improve information sharing between the police and those agencies, strengthening the system for risk managing RSOs.

Total Benefits

173. Total benefits across all monetised set up and ongoing benefit categories are **estimated to range between £5.0 million (PV) and £13.2 million (PV), with a central estimate of £8.4 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

174. The wide range in the cost saving estimates is due to the sensitivity analysis to account for uncertainty over the number of RSOs to apply for a removal of indefinite requirements and the subsequent police acceptance rate. Another leading factor is the sensitivity analysis used to account for technical and unreported breaches of notification requirements.

175. There are a range of non-monetised benefits attached to the measures that are not incorporated into the NPSV estimates. These include the equality benefits of the new virtual notifications and the efficiencies generated by the reform of the SOA 2003, section 96B warrant procedure. These non-monetised benefits are considered in conjunction with the monetised benefits.

Total costs and benefits, NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

176. Total monetised costs are **estimated to range between £5.2 million and £41.1 million, with a central estimate of £15.9 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.** Total monetised benefits are **estimated to range between £5.0 million and £13.2 million, with a central figure of £8.4 million (PV).**

177. The Net Present Social Value (NPSV) of the reform measures is estimated to range between **-£0.2 million and -£27.8 million, with a central estimate of -£7.5 million (PV)** over the 10-year appraisal period.

178. As there is no cost to business, **both the Business Net Present Value (BNPV) and the net cost (EANDCB⁶¹) to business is zero.**

⁶¹ The net direct cost to business is defined as the Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost to Business (EANDCB) and is a measure used by the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) to assess the regulatory burden on business.

Table 5: Summary costs, benefits, NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB £ million (PV), 10 years

Summary of Costs and Benefits	Low	Central	High
Costs			
Set-up costs			
Private sector set-up costs	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public sector set-up costs	2.4	7.3	19.3
Total set-up costs	2.4	7.3	19.3
Ongoing Costs			
Private sector ongoing costs	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public sector ongoing costs	2.8	8.7	21.8
Total ongoing costs	2.8	8.7	21.8
Total costs	5.2	15.9	41.1
Benefits			
Private sector benefits	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public sector benefits	5.0	8.4	13.2
Total benefits	5.0	8.4	13.2
Net Present Social Value	-0.2	-7.5	-27.8
Business Net Present Value	0.0	0.0	0.0
Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost of Business	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Home Office estimates, 2024. Figures may not add up due to rounding.

Value for money (VfM)

179. The non-monetised benefits associated with the preferred option, such as increased public protection from high-risk offenders through improved monitoring and name change restrictions, may counteract the negative NPV in the central and high scenarios and expedite various strategic objectives.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

General assumptions and data

180. While efforts have been made to understand the costs and benefits to all affected groups, all costs and benefits are non-monetised. The guidance is currently at an early stage of development and there is limited evidence/data to produce a monetised appraisal. Costs and benefits have been qualitatively assessed.

Costs

Public Sector

181. There will be set-up familiarisation costs whereby police officers and other professions in scope will read the updated guidance. Familiarisation costs to the police and other professions are assumed to be minimal. However, the guidance aims to improve efficiency in how

professionals support stalking cases as it will set out clearly in one place processes and ways of working.

Right to Know

182. This statutory guidance aims to reduce uncertainty around current legislation rather than introduce changes to legislation so set up costs are assumed to be minimal. Those authorising the decision to provide the victim with the name of the perpetrator will likely already be somewhat familiar with the existing process as part of their current role. However, the guidance aims to improve efficiency in how professionals support stalking cases as it will set out clearly in one place processes and ways of working.

Benefits

183. Due to a lack of data available, this EN will provide only qualitative assessment of the possible benefits of the proposed legislation.

184. The guidance will provide improved support to police and other agencies when dealing directly with stalking cases, by providing a framework to help them respond and guide them on who to work with. Through this mechanism the measure intends to improve the support given to victims of stalking and improve victim experience. It also intends to ensure perpetrators and those who pose a risk are better managed.

Right to Know

185. Statutory guidance will provide improved clarity for the police on the processes surrounding releasing identifying information on suspects to victims, without breaching data protection legislation. With better clarity the service police provide to victims should improve and improve victim experience.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

179. As there is no cost to business the net cost (EANDCB⁶²) to business is zero. As the equivalent annual net direct costs to the public sector are less than +/- £20 million, an Impact Assessment (IA) is not required for this intervention and an EN has been prepared.

Value for money

180. An NPSV has not been calculated, as it has not been possible to estimate monetised costs and benefits for this policy. However, costs of implementing the guidance are assumed to be minimal and there are non-monetised benefits including improved clarity for police when processing stalking cases and releasing information on potentially high-risk perpetrators leading to improved victim experiences during the police/legal process.

⁶² The net direct cost to business is defined as the Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost to Business (EANDCB) and is a measure used by the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) to assess the regulatory burden on business.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

General assumptions and data

181. The impacts of the Option 1 are relative to the counterfactual Option 0 baseline. This EN quantifies the potential impact of this legislative package, notably the impact of implementing a standalone CCE offence, monetising costs, and benefits where possible. The policy is assumed to come into force in 2026/27 and some of the impacts of this legislation are assumed to be delayed. The table below summarises how the impacts of this legislation are incurred over time.

Table 6: Demonstration of delayed impacts

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 and Year 4	Year 5 onwards
<p>Beginning of the Crime and Policing Bill's appraisal period.</p> <p>CCE is not yet implemented, there is no CJS impact in Year 1.</p> <p>Familiarisation costs are incurred in Year 1, as individuals and organisations familiarise themselves with the legislation in preparation for the start of Year 2.</p>	<p>CCE policy is implemented at the beginning of Year 2.</p> <p>Simplifying assumption that impacts in year one will be delayed by six months. This means no additional prison places are required in Year 2. However, there is an impact on courts and legal aid.</p>	<p>The steady state of charges and convictions for CCE is reached. Full costs of ongoing prison places are incurred.</p> <p>One-off prison place set-up costs are incurred in Year 3 only.</p> <p>Full CJS costs for prison places, courts, legal aid and orders are incurred.</p>	<p>Probation begins for the first batch of prisoners sentenced in Year 2, who are assumed to serve an average of 2.4 years in custody and released on licence at the start of Year 5.</p> <p>Year 5 onwards represents the steady state for annual ongoing costs.</p>

182. There is limited available data to assess the prevalence of CCE. To mitigate the uncertainty, three different sources have been combined to estimate a range of impacts. These scenarios are compared to the baseline to estimate the impact of this policy.

183. To establish the baseline for the current number of CCE offenders and their impact on the prison system, the following approach has been taken:

- a. Firstly, CJS data⁶³ for two proxy offences; Modern Slavery (MS) offences under the MSA⁶⁴, and inchoate offences under the SCA⁶⁵ are combined. These proxy offences were selected as they cover similar criminal behaviours to those in the proposed new

⁶³ To gather data on the two proxy offences the Home Office used CJS data to see the number of people prosecuted, charged and sentenced. Sourced here: Criminal Justice System Quarterly Statistics (June 2024). Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

⁶⁴ Modern Slavery Act 2015: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/30/contents>

⁶⁵ Serious Crime Act 2007: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2007/27/contents>

offence. Given the limited legislative gap (largely due to the significant degree of overlap between the CCE offence and the offences of slavery and human trafficking under the MSA), some CCE offenders are likely already being prosecuted for these crimes.

- b. While these data sources capture the potential number of criminal exploitation offenders, they are not specific to offences including children. To refine the baseline to only include offences involving children, offence numbers are reduced using internal management data from the National County Lines Coordination Centre (NCLCC) on the proportion of County Lines exploitation victims that are children, and the proportion of County Lines linked NRM referrals⁶⁶ related to children.
184. The baseline estimate is that there are an average of 159 individuals who are charged for CCE offending each year. Prosecution and sentencing rates for these offences are then applied, estimating that 29 of these offenders are typically sentenced to immediate custody each year. Finally, the average custodial sentence lengths (ACSL) for these offences are used to estimate the current prison impact of this crime type in absence of this policy, which is estimated to be 67 prison places per year.
 185. The key assumption when estimating the additional impact of the new offence on the CJS is that the offence will not identify a new cohort of offenders previously unknown to the CJS. Those identified as committing CCE are assumed to have either been convicted of a proxy offence, in which case they are included in the baseline; or convicted of another offence linked to their CCE behaviour, but evidential difficulties or a charging decision meant there was no conviction for the proxy offences.
 186. In this latter scenario, the new CCE offence will increase the likelihood of a charge and conviction for their exploitative behaviour, which will create an additional cost to the CJS. For instance, CCE offenders involved in County Lines will be on trial for crimes such as drug supply, violent offences, and weapons offences. Sentencing for these crimes and for CCE is assumed to be concurrent, and the additional sentence is estimated at around nine months. This is estimated by subtracting the average sentence length for drug trafficking, chosen as a typical offence given the close links between CCE and County Lines, from the average sentence length for Modern Slavery.
 187. The three methods used to estimate the range of impacts resulting from this policy are set out below. All three of these scenarios assume a 5 per cent charge rate, 50 per cent conviction rate, 58 per cent prosecution rate and 82 per cent custodial rate, and that for all convictions, 50 per cent of the sentence will be served in prison⁶⁷.
 - 1) **Proxy offence-based estimates using CJS data** – this approach uses existing data on MS and inchoate offence prosecutions to estimate the volume of annual CCE offenders, estimated at around 7,600. These offenders are subject to the same prosecution and sentencing rates as MS offenders, but an increased charge rate of 5 per cent, compared to the current MS charge rate of 2 per cent. This increased charge rate reflects the assumption that the new offence and associated statutory guidance will make it easier

⁶⁶ The Home Office were able to get the amount of victims that are children relating to County lines using the proportion of NRM referrals found in table 19, sourced here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/modern-slavery-nrm-and-dtn-statistics-end-of-year-summary-2023>

⁶⁷ These assumptions are based off CJS statistics for comparable offences to CCE, including Modern Slavery, inchoate offence under the Serious Crime Act 2007, and Coercive and Controlling Behaviour. These statistics are sourced from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

to charge CCE offenders. Using this approach produces a central estimate of 65 prison places required per year, with a range of 45 to 93.

- 2) **Prevalence-based estimates using Children in Need (CiN) data** – this approach is based on annual CiN data⁶⁸, on children at risk of CCE to estimate the prevalence of CCE. The Home Office’s central scenario estimates around 14,500 child victims each year, which is then adjusted using internal management information to estimate volumes of adult perpetrators. Applying the prosecution, charge, conviction, and sentencing assumptions set out above produces a central estimate of 69 prison places, with a range of 59 to 79.
 - 3) **Prosecution-based estimates using Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) data** – this approach is based on CPS data for cases related to MS offences. These data show significantly higher volumes of prosecutions and convictions than CJS data. CPS data include all cases linked to MS, regardless of whether the final charge or conviction is for MS, whereas the CJS data cover cases for MS offences only. As with the CJS approach, the number of prosecutions is adjusted to account only for estimated cases with child victims. Applying the prosecution, charge, conviction, and sentencing assumptions set out above produces a central estimate of 80 prison places with a range of 56 to 109.
188. As the approaches above account for a wide range of uncertainty and incorporate a number of uncertain assumptions, the lower-bound estimates fall below the baseline estimate for prison places. These have been excluded. This is because it would be irrational to expect the volumes of required prison places to fall as a result of the new offence. The overall estimate for required prison places is formed using the central and upper bound estimates of the above approaches, giving a central estimate of 80 prison places, with a range of 65 to 109. Subtracting the baseline from this gives the additional prison places required for the new CCE offence, which is a **central estimate of 14 additional prison places**, and a range of 9 to 32.
189. Additional prison places will also be required for breaches of the new CCE orders. The approaches above estimate a total of 140 (102 to 209) annual prosecutions and convictions that may lead to an order. Based on the assumptions for granting and breaches of orders used in the MSA IA⁶⁹, the central scenario estimates fewer than 10 breaches of orders per year. This means there will be **one additional prison place required for breaches**, with a range from 1 to 8.
190. The overall estimate for additional annual prison places is **between 10 and 40, with a central estimate of 15**.

COSTS

Set-up costs: Familiarisation Costs and Prison Place Set-Up Costs

191. Individuals and organisations will be required to become familiar with the new legislation. The Home Secretary will have a power to issue statutory guidance; if issued, there would be a duty on certain people to have due regard to such statutory guidance, such as the police and other applicant bodies. Legal professionals will also need to familiarise themselves with the

⁶⁸ Published data from the CiN is used to estimate the prevalence of CCE sourced here: <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-in-need>

⁶⁹ The assumptions on the number of orders granted and % of breaches are based on the MSA IA. Found here: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7dfe3740f0b62302688791/MSB_IA.pdf

legislation, and managers in support sector organisations working with vulnerable and exploited individuals may also read the legislation.

192. Total familiarisation costs associated with this legislative change are estimated to be between **£30,000 and £0.4 million, with a central estimate of £0.17 million.**
193. A one-off set-up cost of around £630,000 (based on 2025/26 prices and including 20 per cent optimism bias) is costed for each additional prison place anticipated to be required as a result of this legislation.
194. Total, discounted, prison set-up costs are estimated to be between **£5.7 million and £24.5 million, with a central estimate of £8.8 million.**

Ongoing costs: Prison Costs

195. The analysis estimates that between 10 to 40 additional prison places will be required per year as a result of the new offence, with a central estimate of 15. This number of places is multiplied by the annual cost of a prisoner indicated by MoJ data to be £52,000 in 2024/25 prices. This cost is uplifted to 2025/26 prices with a 20 per cent optimism bias applied to give a cost of around £64,000 per prisoner annually. This results in an ongoing annual cost of around **£0.9 million.** Over the 10-year appraisal period, this leads to a total discounted cost of between **£4.6 million and £19.9 million, with a central estimate of £7.2 million.** These costs are inclusive of the required prison places for both the new offence and the related civil orders.

Ongoing costs: Probation costs

196. The additional probation time for offenders is estimated based on the ACSL of the new CCE offence, assuming that 50 per cent of the sentence, equivalent to 0.73 years, will be served in custody, with the entirety of the remaining 50 per cent served on probation, that is there is no re-offending or breach of probation.
197. The associated probation cost is calculated by multiplying the number of offenders sentenced to custody for a CCE offence by the additional probation time and then applying MoJ unit costs. The modelling accounts for a delayed impact, based on the average sentence length of 2.4 years for both the baseline and new CCE offence, resulting in an annual ongoing cost of £70,000, with a range between £40,000 and £180,000, with discounted costs across the appraisal period of £0.3 million, with a range of £0.2 million and £0.9 million.

Ongoing costs: Court and Legal Aid Costs

198. All additional CCE offenders are assumed to be convicted for another offence related to their CCE-linked offending. This means that in the absence of this new offence, these individuals would nonetheless be put on trial and incur court costs. There are **assumed to be no additional court costs** for the new CCE offence.
199. However, as offences for breaching the new CCE orders are assumed to be additional, breaches of these orders will incur additional court costs. Based on the **estimate of one breach per year in the central scenario**, with an upper bound of 7 breaches, annual court costs are estimated to be negligible, with an upper-bound estimate of **£0.03 million** per year.
200. While individuals being tried for CCE are already being tried for another offence, and would be in receipt of legal aid, there is an assumed increase in the average legal aid cost, given the potential complexity of this offence. Legal aid costs are estimated using the difference between the legal aid costs for Class A drugs supply and the unit cost for Modern Slavery, giving an annual cost estimate **of £0.8 million, with a range between £0.6 million and £1.2 million.**

201. Over the 10-year appraisal period, discounted court and legal aid costs are estimated to be between **£4.0 million and £8.6 million, with a central estimate of £5.5 million.**

Ongoing costs: Orders Costs

202. The costs associated with breaches of the new orders are included in the CJS costs outlined above. There will be additional costs associated with the setting up of new orders and for appeals against the orders. The assumed unit costs for CCE orders are based on those used in the Modern Slavery Act 2015 IA⁷⁰ for Slavery and Trafficking Orders, found in Section 6.

203. Based on the 140 (between 102 and 209) annual prosecutions and convictions that may lead to an order, and an estimated order application rate of 1 per cent to 30 per cent, there will be between 15 (between 1 and 63) CCE orders granted each year. This gives an annual cost of between **£0.0 million and £0.1 million, with a central estimate of £0.02 million.**

Non-monetised costs: Special Measures

204. Individuals involved in certain cases are eligible to receive special measures if they are perceived to be vulnerable or at risk when testifying. These special measures will apply to victims in proceedings for the new CCE offence, given that all the victims and a large proportion of witnesses will be children, and the government are extending automaticity of special measures to victims in CCE proceedings.

205. However, children are automatically eligible for special measures under the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999⁷¹, and would already be in receipt of special measures in the baseline scenario. Following discussion with MoJ, it was agreed that the proposed offence would have a negligible impact on the costs of implementing special measures. These have not been monetised.

Non-monetised costs: Monitoring of orders

206. The new CCE orders may require some additional resourcing from the police to monitor individuals who are subject to orders. These costs have not been quantified due to the lack of data on existing orders, as these costs are resourced through wider police budgets.

Total costs

207. Table 7 below shows the breakdown of the costs of this policy, which, when discounted over 10 years, are estimated to be between **£13.4 million and £50.1 million, with a central estimate of £20.3 million.**

Table 7: Total 10-year discounted costs (PV; £m; 2025/26 prices)

	Low	Central	High
Familiarisation	0.03	0.17	0.43
Prison set-up	5.28	8.22	22.90
Total transition	5.31	8.38	23.32
Prison ongoing	3.82	5.94	16.55

⁷⁰ The unit costs used for the CCE orders were based on the MS IA, sourced here: modern slavery Act 2015 Impact Assessment: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7dfe3740f0b62302688791/MSB_IA.pdf

⁷¹ Children are automatically eligible for special measures, as per the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1999/23/contents>

Probation costs	0.20	0.32	0.88
Court and Legal Aid	4.01	5.48	8.57
Orders	0.01	0.17	0.75
Total ongoing	8.04	11.90	26.75
Total costs	13.15	20.29	50.07

Source: Home Office estimates, 2025

Benefits

Monetised Benefits

208. There were no identified monetised benefits for Option 1 due to the lack of available evidence.

Non-Monetised Benefits

Deterrence and early intervention

209. The proposed CCE offence and associated orders may create a deterrent effect for potential offenders. Engagement with police forces revealed that offenders in County Lines cases are often willing to plead guilty to drug charges, in the hope of avoiding a charge for offences related to exploitation, such as MS charges. The creation of a specific offence and related orders for CCE may have a deterrent effect on some potential offenders who may be unwilling to be labelled as involved in child exploitation.

210. In addition to the deterrence effect, the new civil preventative orders may be able to prevent CCE conduct before it occurs or to prevent it from reoccurring. Civil preventative tools will allow the police to intervene earlier, thereby stopping CCE conduct earlier, changing the behaviour and conduct of potential offenders and helping to protect child victims. There is no evidence available to quantify the magnitude of these effects.

Incarceration

211. Under Option 1, it is assumed that some offenders will serve longer sentences as a result of being convicted for CCE. While incarceration does not prevent all offending, those involved in CCE may reduce or even stop their offending while they are in prison. There is a benefit in avoided crime from longer sentencing. However, there is insufficient evidence to quantify this benefit.

Social benefits

212. CCE is a form of child abuse which has harmful short-term and long-term effects on victims, on local communities, and on wider society. Any reduction in CCE offending through deterrence or incarceration effects will likely have significant wider social benefits. However, there is insufficient evidence to quantify these benefits.

Data quality

213. The creation of a specific offence of CCE will lead to the collection of data on offences and CJS outcomes for CCE. This will improve the limited evidence base that exists for CCE and will lead to improved analysis in the future to better inform policy development.

214. The specific CCE offence and related orders will also allow for better identification and monitoring of CCE offenders. This may allow police to better identify perpetrators reducing the risk of them carrying out similar offences in the future.

Proceeds of crime

215. CCE will be added to the list of “criminal lifestyle offences” in Schedule 2 and Part 2 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002⁷², meaning that an individual that commits a CCE offence meets the criteria of having a criminal lifestyle. The presumption is that all of their assets and expenditure in the past six years are criminally gained and are factored into the amount liable to pay under the confiscation order, unless the defendant can prove that the assets are owned legitimately and legally. The income from this has not been monetised, as the assumption is that the income the criminal activity enabled by the CCE offence (e.g. selling drugs) will already be subject to POCA.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

216. As it has not been possible to monetise the benefits, the NPSV is equal to the overall costs of the policy, that is -£20.3 million. As there are no estimated costs to business, the BNPV and the EANDCB are both zero.

217. Instead, analysis was conducted to estimate the number of offences that would need to be prevented to breakeven with the estimated costs. This was based on the unit cost of labour exploitation taken from the economic and social cost of MS⁷³, adjusted to 2025/26 prices, giving a unit cost of around £422,000. This cost figure is the social and economic cost and does not represent a financial cost. Compared to the total 10-year cost of £20.3 million, this means that 48 CCE cases would need to be prevented in the central scenario to break even over the appraisal period, with a range of 32 to 119.

218. This means that the policy could demonstrate a positive social impact if it **prevents at least five CCE offences per year**. This prevention could arise through the deterrence and incapacitation effects discussed in the non-monetised benefits section. Given the estimated number of victims are estimated to be in the tens of thousands, **it is likely that Option 1 will lead to a net positive social value**.

219. There is no expected cost to business of this measure.

Proposal 4: Stalking Protection Orders on conviction or acquittal

General assumptions and data

220. The effects of the preferred option are modelled relative to the counterfactual ‘Do Nothing’ (Option 0) baseline.

221. An optimism bias rate of 20 per cent has been applied to the ongoing prison costs unit cost taken from the MoJ.

222. The initial number of those assumed to be convicted of stalking in first year of appraisal is 1,045.⁷⁴

⁷² Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. Sourced here: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/29/contents>

⁷³ The economic and social costs of modern slavery (publishing.service.gov.uk): <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5b59d143ed915d0b92a4f53e/economic-and-social-costs-of-modern-slavery-horr100.pdf>

⁷⁴ GOV.UK (2024). This is the YE December 2023 figure taken from the Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

223. The number of stalking convictions is assumed to increase by 18 per cent annually. This figure is based on the 2019 to 2020 average growth rate.⁷⁵ This time period was chosen due to a change in the way stalking offences were recorded. In April 2020 there was a change to the Home Office Counting Rules resulting in an increase in stalking offences being recorded. This change was revoked in May 2023 but resulted in data for 2020/21 to 2022/23 not being comparable. The data from 2019 and 2020 is the most applicable to the appraisal.
224. The total breach numbers, custody rate and ACSL for a restraining order and SPO is calculated using an average from the previous five years of available data.⁷⁶
225. The marginal propensity to breach each civil order is calculated using the proportion of the total number of orders issued between 2019 and 2020 compared to the total number of breaches in the same period. The total number of restraining orders and SPOs issued is excluded from the analysis as the data is official-sensitive.
226. The respective marginal propensity to breach, custody rate and ACSL of the specific orders will remain constant throughout the appraisal period.
227. The proportion of those convicted of stalking that will be issued an SPO ranges according to the sensitivity analysis scenarios. The low scenario assumes an 80 per cent SPO rate, the central scenario assumes a 90 per cent rate and the high scenario assumes a rate of 100 per cent.⁷⁷
228. Offenders will only serve 50 per cent of their custodial sentences for breaching the respective civil orders.⁷⁸
229. The cost of a prison place is derived from internal MoJ analysis.

Monetised Costs

The Displacement Rate

230. The displacement rate is the volume of current restraining orders issued to stalking perpetrators at conviction and acquittal that will be transferred to an SPO as they become applicable at this stage of the court process. The low scenario assumes a 100 per cent displacement rate that is, all of the SPOs issued within the appraisal would have originally been a restraining order. The central scenario assumes a 50 per cent displacement rate, whereas the high scenario assumes a 0 per cent displacement rate.

Table 8 – SPO and restraining order data

Data point	Stalking Protection Order	Restraining Order
Propensity to breach order	10.42%	35%
Custody rate of order	28%	47%
ACSL of order (months)	6.7	5.6

⁷⁵ GOV.UK (2024). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

⁷⁶ GOV.UK (2024). The average is used to account for potential anomalies for example, COVID-19. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

⁷⁷ The proportion of those convicted of stalking that will be issued an SPO is based on limited evidence, so sensitivity analysis is used for a range of scenarios.

⁷⁸ This assumption is consistent with MoJ advice on custodial sentences for other similar severity offences.

Source: Home Office Internal Analysis based on CJS statistics

231. The restraining order breach has a higher propensity to breach and a higher custody rate. As more restraining orders are replaced by SPOs in the low scenario, this will generate a cost saving for the CJS.

Costs

Low Scenario

232. The low scenario assumes a 100 per cent displacement rate for restraining orders to SPOs. The net impact of the analysis is a reduction of 202 restraining order breaches and 110 less offenders sentenced to immediate custody. The prison place impact of the policy is calculated by multiplying the number of offenders in immediate custody by the respective ACSL in years of each civil order. The calculation is then multiplied by 50 per cent to account for the MoJ assumption on immediate custody duration.
233. The net prison place impact of the low scenario is **minus 24** in the first year of appraisal. This figure is assumed to rise gradually, consistent with the modelled stalking conviction growth rate.

Central Scenario

234. The central scenario assumes a 50 per cent displacement rate for restraining orders to SPOs, meaning 50 per cent of the SPOs issued in the central scenario would have originally been issued as a restraining order. The other 50 per cent is modelled to be new SPOs which leads to a lower net reduction in restraining orders. The proportion of stalking perpetrators that are issued an SPO is 90 per cent.
235. The number of estimated SPOs issued that are displaced from current restraining orders is 470 in the first year of appraisal. The net impact of this number of displaced restraining orders is a reduction of 114 breaches and 62 offenders sentenced to immediate custody, utilising the assumptions set out in Table 8.
236. The new SPOs issued as a result of the policy is also an estimated 470 in the first year of appraisal. The new SPOs are modelled to increase the number of breaches by 49 in the first year of appraisal, alongside a subsequent increase of 14 offenders sentenced to immediate custody.
237. The net impact of the 50 per cent displacement rate within the central scenario is a reduction of 65 restraining order breaches and 48 offenders sentenced to immediate custody.
238. The estimated net prison place impact of the central scenario is **minus 10** in the first year of appraisal. This figure is assumed to rise gradually, consistent with the modelled stalking conviction growth rate.

High Scenario

239. The high scenario assumes a zero per cent displacement rate. All of the SPOs issued within the analysis will be additional and will not be displaced from the current numbers of restraining orders issued. The proportion of stalking perpetrators issued an SPO under this scenario is 100 per cent. As there is no negating factor of a reduced number of restraining orders issued, the negative impact on the CJS will be the highest under this scenario.
240. All of the modelled stalking perpetrators (1,045) are issued an SPO. This figure translates to 109 breaches and 31 additional offenders sentenced to immediate custody in the first year of appraisal using the SPO percentage assumptions.
241. The estimated net prison place impact of the high scenario is **nine**. This figure is assumed to rise gradually, consistent with the modelled stalking conviction growth rate.

Prison Costs

242. The impact of the preferred option on the CJS is assumed to generate cost savings under both the low and central scenarios. The analysis projects a reduction in cases processed through the courts, subsequently reducing the number of perpetrators eligible for legal aid support.
243. Fewer perpetrators will be sentenced to immediate custody, creating a negative prison place impact in the low and central scenarios. The high scenario assumes that the number of breaches will rise, increasing the pressure on the CJS through the court, legal aid, and prison systems.
244. The prison place impact projections are calculated by multiplying the number of additional cases by the custody rate of breaching the civil order. This volume is then multiplied by the ACSL of the breach; the low and central scenarios using the ACSL of breaching a restraining order (5.6 months) whereas the high scenario uses the ACSL of breaching an SPO (6.7 months). This figure is divided by 12 to convert from months to years and multiplied by 50 per cent.

245. The first year of prison costs are accounted for as a set-up cost. The MoJ unit cost for an additional prison place is an internal figure that has been developed by MoJ analysts. The prison set-up costs are estimated to range between **-£15.3 million and £5.4 million, with a central estimate of -£6.2 million**. The low and central scenarios present a cost saving due to the reduction in the number of perpetrators to be processed through the CJS.
246. MoJ internal estimates have been used to estimate the annual cost of a prisoner place. For the purpose of the analysis, this figure is updated to 2025/26 prices. A 20 per cent optimism bias rate is also applied.
247. The ongoing prison costs are estimated to range between **-£30.1 million and £10.6 million, with a central estimate of -£12.1 million**. The low and central scenarios present a cost saving due to the reduction in perpetrators to be processed through the CJS and be issued custodial sentences.

Court Costs

248. The estimated volumes per court are calculated using the proportion of civil order breaches processed in the Magistrates' and Crown Courts. The proportion applied is dependent on the projected impact of each scenario. The low and central scenarios assume a reduction in restraining order breaches; the proportion of restraining order breaches processed through the Magistrates' and Crown Courts was 77 per cent and 23 per cent respectively for the year ending December 2023⁷⁹.
249. The high scenario assumes an increase in the number of SPO breaches; the proportion of SPO breaches processed through the Magistrates' and Crown Courts was 76 per cent and 24 per cent respectively for the year ending December 2023⁸⁰. The volume figures are multiplied by internal MoJ court unit costs for the breach of a civil order offence.
250. The court costs are estimated to range between **-£5.9 million and £3.2 million, with a central estimate of -£1.9 million over the 10-year appraisal period**. The low and central scenarios present a cost saving due to the reduction in cases to be processed through the court system.

Legal Aid Costs

251. The legal aid volumes and costs are calculated using financial eligibility assumptions and unit costs provided by the MoJ.
252. The legal aid costs are estimated to range between **-£2.6 million and £1.5 million, with a central estimate of -£0.8 million over the 10-year appraisal period**. The low and central scenarios present a cost saving due to the reduction in perpetrators to be processed through the CJS and be eligible for legal aid support.

Probation Costs

253. The MoJ have developed internal estimates for the monthly unit cost of probation for offenders released from immediate custody. The figures (given in 2023/24 prices) have been updated to 2025/26 prices with a 20 per cent optimism bias rate applied. The unit cost figures are multiplied by the number of additional breaches derived from the absence from address

⁷⁹ GOV.UK (2024). Available at:<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

⁸⁰ GOV.UK (2024). Available at:<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2023>

measure that are expected to result in immediate custody. The updated unit costs are multiplied by the ACSL as well as the average probation length assumption.

254. The overall ongoing probation costs are estimated to range between **-£2.8 million and £1.1 million with a central estimate of -£0.9 million (PV) over the 10-year appraisal period.**

Total costs

255. The total estimated costs for the policy range between -£56.7 million and £21.9 million, with a central estimate of -£21.9 million.

Non-Monetised Costs

256. The secondary legislation will be implemented alongside the distribution of guidance on SPOs for both the CPS and court professionals. This is due to a lack of exposure to SPOs for these agencies as the orders are currently managed by the police.
257. The time taken to read the guidance in sufficient detail will represent an opportunity cost for the reader as this will forego any other beneficial activities during this period. However, due to lack information on the length of guidance and volumes of those required to read they have not been monetised.

Benefits

258. Due to a lack of data available, this EN will provide only qualitative assessment of the possible benefits of the proposed legislation.

Positive requirements reducing the strain on the Criminal Justice System.

259. Targeted positive requirement programmes for stalking perpetrators that have been convicted or acquitted may generate further cost savings for the CJS. The scale of this impact is dependant of the programmes on the perpetrator's propensity to breach. The current breach rate of an SPO is 10.42 per cent. If this falls to 7.5 per cent as a result of the positive requirements, the policy will reduce the number of breaches in 2025/26 by approximately 36.
260. If the breach rate falls to 2.5 per cent as a result of the policy, this will reduce the number of breaches in 2025/26 by approximately 98. As the breach rate falls due to positive requirements then the number of breaches will continue to fall. The reduction in breaches will lead to savings for the CJS, including on prison costs, court costs, and legal aid costs. This analysis has been excluded from the monetised cost savings due to the limited data available on the impact of positive requirement programmes on a stalking perpetrator's propensity to breach their SPO.

Higher levels of victim wellbeing

261. Improved ability to monitor and manage stalking perpetrators will aim to create higher feelings of safety for victims. Stalking is proven to have adverse impacts on the mental wellbeing of victims and in certain cases can lead to escalations of serious violence. Addressing underlying behaviours aims to permanently rehabilitate perpetrators of stalking and ensure the improvements to victim-survivor wellbeing and safety are comprehensive and long-term. The rehabilitation programme may also prevent further victims as well as current victims of the stalking perpetrators.

Harm avoided

262. The availability of SPOs to be issued at the conviction or acquittal of stalking perpetrators will aim to remove victim and survivors from high-risk situations. There is evidence of a link

between stalking and domestic abuse as the majority of stalking offences are committed by ex-partners⁸¹.

263. The published Cost of Domestic Abuse Report estimates that the economic and social cost of one domestic abuse victim is the equivalent of £43,937 (2025/26 prices)⁸². If the SPO policy can prevent at least one domestic abuse victim from taking place, then it will offer further economic and social cost savings in the form of physical and emotional harm avoided for the victim.
264. However, it must also be noted that in domestic abuse cases a Domestic Abuse Protection Order (DAPO) could be made once they are rolled out nationally.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

265. The low and central scenarios assume the impact on the CJS will generate cost savings. The Net Present Value of the policy is estimated to range between **-£21.9 million and £56.7 million, with a central estimate of £21.9 million.**

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

General assumptions and data

266. The impacts of the Option 1 are relative to the counterfactual baseline Option 0.
267. Significant evidence gaps exist regarding the prevalence of cuckooing. Since cuckooing is not yet a classified offence and there is neither a national database nor a standardised approach to recording. The methods used by law enforcement and intelligence partners to record current cases are not comprehensively understood.
268. The latest County Lines Strategic Threat Risk Assessment⁸³ details that the prevalence of drug-related cuckooing can be partially inferred from the number of drug lines that use cuckooing as part of their business model, quoting 728 instances of this in 2023/24. It is acknowledged that one drug line could be linked to multiple cuckooed addresses, meaning prevalence may be higher.
269. Given the absence of publicly available data to inform the prevalence of non-drug related cuckooing and the uncertainty in the data to inform drug-related cuckooing, internal management information from the National County Lines Coordination Centre (NCLCC) and Crimestoppers has been used to estimate a potential annual number of offences, though this estimate remains highly uncertain.
270. Consultation with the MoJ has shaped the modelling assumptions, for example, it uses data on Controlling and Coercive Behaviour⁸⁴ to proxy the charge, prosecution, and conviction

⁸¹ Stalking analysis reveals domestic abuse link, Available here: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/cps/news/stalking-analysis-reveals-domestic-abuse-link>

⁸² GOV.UK (2019). The economic and social costs of domestic abuse. Available at: [The economic and social costs of domestic abuse - GOV.UK](#)

⁸³ County Lines Strategic Threat Risk Assessment 2023/24. Available here: <https://www.npcc.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/publications/publications-log/national-crime-coordination-committee/2024/county-lines-strategic-threat-risk-assessment.pdf>

⁸⁴ CJS quarterly statistics – controlling and coercive behaviour proxy data. Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

rates, as well as the sentencing rates and custodial sentence length for cuckooing. Applying these proxy rates to the internal management data for the annual number of cuckooing offences, the Home Office estimates that between 8 and 10 offenders will be sentenced to immediate custody for cuckooing per year.

271. The ACSL for a cuckooing offence is expected to be two years. The Home Office assumes that 50 per cent of the ACSL will be served in custody, which means the sentence length served in custody is reduced to one year. The Home Office assumes that the remaining 50 per cent of the sentence will be served on probation. The same number of prison places will be required (8 to 10).
272. The Home Office assumes that all offenders charged with cuckooing would have been charged with another offence (that is, drug supply offences) in absence of the new legislation, and that no offender will be charged with cuckooing alone. This assumption has been agreed by MoJ, NCLCC and police forces. MoJ have also advised that a cuckooing offence is likely to be served consecutively⁸⁵, meaning the cuckooing sentence will be served after the original offence in absence of this legislation.
273. The main impact to the CJS is expected to arise from an increased custodial sentencing length following a cuckooing conviction. There is an expected increase in associated probation costs as a result of this legislation. The Home Office has assumed that probation costs arise at the end of the sentence served in custody. There is no additional impact expected to His Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Services (HMCTS) or legal aid as a result of this legislation.
274. These modelling assumptions mean that there are delayed impacts of this legislation. These have been set out below:

⁸⁵ A consecutive sentence means you will serve one offence after another. More information can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/types-of-prison-sentence>

Table 9: Demonstration of delayed impact and costs

Year 1	Cuckooing is not yet implemented, there is no impact in Year 1.
Year 2	Cuckooing legislation is implemented at the beginning of Year 2. Simplifying assumption that there will be a one year CJS delay ⁸⁶ . Familiarisation costs begin in Year 2. These costs are only incurred in this year.
Years 3 and 4	Assuming no offender will be charged for cuckooing alone and the most likely baseline offence is a drug supply offence, a 2 year average delay based on the ACSL served for a drug supply offence ⁸⁷ has been modelled. No costs incurred in Years 3 or 4.
Year 5	Due to consecutive sentencing, prison place set up costs begin in Year 5. These costs are only incurred in this year. Ongoing Prison place costs begin in Year 5 and continue to Year 10 of the appraisal period.
Year 6 Onwards	Due to probation costs starting at the end of the average time served in custody, ongoing probation costs begin in Year 6 and continue to Year 10 of the appraisal period.

275. The transition costs (familiarisation and prison set-up costs) are excluded from the average cost per year figure. The average cost per year figure is calculated by dividing the ongoing costs (prison costs and probation costs) by 10, to show the average annual cost over the 10 year appraisal period.

COSTS

Set-up cost 1: Familiarisation Costs

276. Key stakeholders will be required to become familiar with the new legislation, which would include the police, solicitors, and barristers. The Home Office assumes that support sector organisations will not be required to read the legislation. Given their existing experience with cuckooing cases and victim support, these organisations are assumed to already be familiar with the nature of the offence and their associated operational responsibilities which are not expected to change as a result of the legislation.

277. Total familiarisation costs associated with this legislative change are estimated to be between **£0.0 and £0.2 million, with a central estimate of £0.1 million (PV)**. These costs are only incurred in Year one of the appraisal period. This cost is excluded in the average cost per year calculation.

Set-up cost 2: Prison Place Set-Up Costs

⁸⁶ Criminal Justice System data delivery dashboard. Available here: <https://criminal-justice-delivery-data-dashboards.justice.gov.uk/overview>

⁸⁷ Criminal Justice System quarterly statistics. Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024>

278. A one-off set-up fee of £630,000 is costed for each additional prison place anticipated to be required because of this legislation. These costs are not expected to materialise immediately due to the likelihood of a cuckooing sentence being applied consecutively. Due to the sentencing length for this offence being one year, it is assumed that these prison places will only need to be purchased once and can then be re-used in every following year of the appraisal period.
279. Total prison set-up costs are estimated to be between **£4.4 million and £5.5 million, with a central estimate of £5.0 million (PV)**. These costs are only incurred in Year 5 of the appraisal period. This cost is excluded in the average cost per year calculation.

Ongoing cost 1: Prison Costs

280. It is estimated that between 8 to 10 offenders will be sentenced to immediate custody per year. The annual cost per prisoner place is £52,000 (2023/24 prices). In the analysis, the cost per year has been inflated to 2025/26 prices using the GDP deflator⁸⁸, and 20 per cent optimism bias has been applied to give an approximate cost of £64,000 per prisoner annually. This results in an ongoing prison place cost between **£2.5 million and £3.1 million, with a central estimate of £2.8 million (PV)**. These costs are incurred from year five of the appraisal period onwards. This cost is included in the average cost per year calculation.

Ongoing cost 2: Probation Costs

281. The additional probation time for offenders is estimated based on the ACSL of the new cuckooing offence, assuming that 50 per cent of the sentence, equivalent to one year, will be served in custody, with the entirety of the remaining 50 per cent served on probation, which assumes that there will be no re-offending and no breach of probation.
282. The associated probation cost is calculated by multiplying the number of offenders sentenced to custody for a cuckooing offence by the additional probation time and then applying MoJ unit costs. The modelling accounts for a delayed impact based on the ACSL of a cuckooing offence, as well as the baseline offence (assumed to be drug supply) and the average CJS delay, as outlined in Tables X and X.
283. Based on this, the impact of probation is not expected to commence until year six of the appraisal period. The resulting annual ongoing cost is estimated to be £50,000, with a range between £40,000 and £60,000, with **discounted costs across the appraisal period of £0.18 million, with a range of £0.15 million and £0.22 million (PV)**. These costs are incurred from year six of the appraisal period onwards. This cost is included in the average cost per year calculation.

⁸⁸ GDP Deflator – October 2024. Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-october-2024-autumn-budget-2024>

Non-monetised costs: Safeguarding and support services

284. The policy aims to strengthen the police and support services response to cuckooing through increased identification and investigation of cuckooing incidents. This could lead to an increase in the number of victims who are referred for safeguarding and other support services. It is unknown to what extent the legislation will create an additional demand for safeguarding and support services, so is not monetised.

Total costs

285. Total costs of this policy are estimated to be between **£7.1 million and £9.1 million, with a central estimate of £8.0 million (PV)**. This translates to an estimated annual cost of £0.26 million to £0.33 million per year, with a central estimate of £0.30 million (PV).

BENEFITS

Monetised Benefits

286. No benefits for Option 1 have been quantified and monetised due to data and evidence gaps.

Non-Monetised Benefits

287. If this policy were to deter perpetrators from cuckooing, there would be a benefit on an individual level to those targeted and selected as victims. As well as the individual benefit, in each instance of a deterrence of a cuckooing case, there will be cost savings to the police, local authorities and support sector organisations, as well as the CJS.

288. These benefits cannot be monetised due to a lack of evidence on the deterrence effect of this policy, and the specific costs to each stakeholder, given there is no standardised response plan in instances of cuckooing currently.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

289. The Net Present Social Value (NPSV) of this policy is estimated to be between **-£7.1 million and -£9.1 million, with a central estimate of -£8.0 million (PV)**. This is a partial NPSV, made up only of the costs of this policy due to the absence of monetised benefits.

290. There is no expected costs to business, so BNPV and EANDCB are likely to be zero.

291. It is expected that there will be minimal costs of this intervention to the police and support sector organisations, who already work to tackle cases of cuckooing. The largest costs of this intervention are likely to arise from the increased custodial sentence that offenders will receive for a cuckooing offence. This impact is expected to be low but remains uncertain and subject to the prevalence of cuckooing cases as well as the way in which courts will apply sentencing.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

General Assumptions and Data

292. The impacts of the Option 1 are relative to the counterfactual baseline Option 0.

Criminal offence relating to fine-tuned artificial intelligence models assumptions

293. Individuals possessing fine-tuned AI models designed to produce CSAM are already engaged in taking or making CSAM.⁸⁹ The analysis is modelled as a change in sentence length for those offenders who will be charged concurrent with the proposed legislation.
294. 0.02 per cent⁹⁰ of CSAM is AI generated. This is used as a proxy for the proportion of individuals taking or making CSAM that are doing so with the use of an AI model.
295. The number of cases is estimated to increase by 36 per cent⁹¹ each year over the first five years from the base year as AI activity will grow, thereafter reaching steady state.

Possessing guidance on creating synthetic or partially synthetic child sexual abuse material assumptions

296. There is little evidence surrounding the prevalence of AI paedophile manuals. The existing offence for 'possess a paedophile manual' (which excludes AI manuals) has resulted in a minimum of zero and maximum of one prosecution in the past five years.⁹² These are used in scenario analysis for the low and high scenario.
297. The central scenario estimates zero cases in the base year, where 0.02 per cent⁹³ of paedophile manuals are assumed to be AI paedophile manuals.
298. The number of cases is estimated to increase by 36 per cent⁹⁴ each year over the first five years from the base year as AI activity will grow and thereafter reach steady state.

⁸⁹ The proxy offence is taking or making, distributing or publishing indecent photographs of children. An average of 2,802 offenders were proceeded against annually for this offence over the past five years, as derived from the MoJ's CJS statistics quarterly: Outcomes by Offence data tool: December 2023:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6646118dbd01f5ed32793d44/outcomes-by-offence-2023.xlsx>

⁹⁰ The Internet Watch Foundation analyse URLs of AI-generated and 'real' images of child sexual abuse:

<https://www.iwf.org.uk/annual-report-2023/trends-and-data/ai-generated-child-sexual-abuse/>

<https://www.iwf.org.uk/annual-report-2023/trends-and-data/reports-analysis/>

⁹¹ The Internet Watch Foundation conducted a snapshot study of AI-specific threads on a dark web CSAM form over a 6 month period: https://admin.iwf.org.uk/media/nadlcb1z/iwf-ai-csam-report_update-public-jul24v13.pdf. The number of threads increased by 18 per cent between September 2023 and March/April 2024.

⁹² Prosecutions and convictions, and sentence outcomes estimates are from the MoJ's CJS statistics quarterly: Outcomes by Offence data tool: December 2023:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6646118dbd01f5ed32793d44/outcomes-by-offence-2023.xlsx>

⁹³ The Internet Watch Foundation analyse URLs of AI-generated and 'real' images of child sexual abuse.

<https://www.iwf.org.uk/annual-report-2023/trends-and-data/ai-generated-child-sexual-abuse/>

<https://www.iwf.org.uk/annual-report-2023/trends-and-data/ai-generated-child-sexual-abuse/>

<https://www.iwf.org.uk/annual-report-2023/trends-and-data/reports-analysis/>

⁹⁴ The Internet Watch Foundation conducted a snapshot study of AI-specific threads on a dark web CSAM form over a 6 month period: https://admin.iwf.org.uk/media/nadlcb1z/iwf-ai-csam-report_update-public-jul24v13.pdf. The number of threads increased by 18 per cent between September 2023 and March/April 2024.

Criminal offence for administrators and moderators of child sexual abuse sites assumptions

299. Individuals who will be charged with the new offence are already being charged with existing but less relevant offences.⁹⁵ The impact is modelled as a change in sentence length for those offenders who would otherwise receive shorter sentences from alternative offences.
300. There is uncertainty surrounding the number of offenders pursued by the CJS and how this may change over time. Following discussions with the NCA, likely higher prosecution rates with the offence would encourage their pursuit of relevant offenders. The NCA's stated ambition is to increase the number of investigations pursued by eight per cent each year following the availability of the new offence. This is used as a proxy for the annual increase in investigations and charges, which reaches a steady state after eight years when operational capacity is reached.

Border Force powers to compel individuals to unlock their device to be searched for known child sexual abuse material assumptions

301. Outcomes data from a pilot of a new tool to digitally search devices in London Gatwick and Manchester Airport for four days each has been used in the model. The pilot resulted in 2.6 cold stops per day per deployment. 10 per cent of searches were refused, and 30 per cent of searches uncovered the possession of indecent images of children (IIOC) which was passed onto the police. The analysis scales this to 1 year where 13 terminals will have the tool, estimating 1,240 annual search refusals, and 3,719 annual possessions of IIOC cases.
302. **Direct impact:** There are currently no implications for refusing a digital device search. Following the proposed measure, a refusal will fall under the wilful obstruction offence. The direct impacts of the measure will result from the potential increase in wilful obstruction offences.
303. **Indirect impact:** As more individuals are compelled to unlock their devices, cases for possession of IIOC are estimated to increase. The indirect impacts of the measure will result from the increase in possession of IIOC offences.

Prison Place Impact Assumptions and Summary

304. Case to charge rates, charge to sentencing rates, and immediate custodial sentence rates are estimated using the existing offences for taking and making IIOC and wilful obstruction and relevant proxy offences (possession of a paedophile manual and administrators and moderators criminal justice outcomes provided by the NCA) detailed above.
305. Community sentence and suspended sentence outcomes are also estimated. A 20 per cent, 22.5 per cent and 25 per cent breach rate of community and suspended sentences is applied in the low, central, and high scenarios, after which an offender will receive a custodial sentence. Estimated prison place volumes combine immediate custody outcomes and breaches.
306. For the possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials and Border Force extension of powers measures, the ACSL is estimated from the past five years of data. For AI models and administrators and moderators of CSA sites measures, where the ACSL is likely to differ from the proxy offence, two thirds of the maximum sentence length is taken due to the availability

⁹⁵ Six sentence examples from 2023/24 have been provided by the NCA. Examples include 'Arranging or facilitating sexual exploitation of a child' which received a six-year sentence, and possession of indecent images of children which received a two-year sentence.

of digital evidence in CSAM trials. It is assumed that 50 per cent of the ACSL is spent in prison in line with automatic release rules.

307. The prison place impact is calculated as: *prison place volumes* * *time served*.
308. Table 10 summarises the 10-year prison place impacts derived following the assumptions above. A 10-year total is displayed due to lack of steady state in measures 26, 27 and 28.

Table 10: Prison Place Impact, 10-year total

Measure	10-year Prison Place Impact		
	Low	Central	High
AI models	-1.52	0	2.74
Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials	0	0	19.91
Administrators and moderators	27.02	36.85	46.77
Border Force extension of powers	3.72	8.37	13.95
<i>Indirect prison impacts</i> ⁹⁶	132.99	281.25	444.79
CSA measures direct total	29.22	45.22	83.37
CSA measures total (incl. indirect)	158.50	318.11	514.20

Source: Home Office internal analysis

Cost assumptions

309. Cost categories include transition costs (familiarisation and prison construction costs) and ongoing costs (legal aid, court costs, probation costs and prison services costs). For measures where the prison impact is estimated as a change in sentence length for existing offenders, legal aid and court costs are not included as there is no estimated change in case volumes.
310. The costs for each measure are determined by the associated case volume and prison place impact estimates.
311. AI models; administrators and moderators of CSA sites, and Border Force powers measures incur **familiarisation costs** which reflect the cost of relevant personnel familiarising themselves with the new or updated legislation. This is not costed for the possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials measure as there won't be standalone guidance for the legislative change, as instructed by policy.
- The ReadingSoft⁹⁷ calculator is used in calculating familiarisation costs to estimate the reading time for a length of guidance.
 - The length of guidance for AI models, administrators and moderators of child sexual abuse sites and Border Force extension of powers is 530, 780, and 760 words respectively. These are proxied off existing guidance and sensitivity analysis tests these assumptions taking +/-50 per cent in the low and high scenarios.
 - The guidance for AI models and possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials measures will be read by CSA teams in policing. The number of staff in CSA teams is

⁹⁶ For the possession of IIOC offence.

⁹⁷ ReadingSoft calculator used to estimate reading speed for a given input of words. Available here: <https://readingsoft.com/>

uncertain, however, an estimate of 1,000 staff has been provided by a police contact within the NPCC. The analysis applies +/-25 per cent sensitivity providing a range of 750 to 1,250 staff in the low and high scenarios.

- d) The ranking of officers has been proxied off the rankings for CSA police teams in 30 forces across England and Wales; 4 per cent inspectors, 12 per cent sergeants, and 84 per cent constables.
- e) Labour cost estimates are derived from the internal Home Office Staff Cost Model which have been inflated to 2025/26 prices.
- f) Differently to the other measures, the guidance for the extension of Border Force powers has already been disseminated and Customs Border Force Officers (BFOs) have already received training. The familiarisation costs arise from the Interim Operational Instruction that will be sent to all staff notifying officers of the new power. Safeguarding and Modern Slavery (SAMS) BFOs will then be expected to lead the update in each port in each shift, further disseminating the update to staff working in relevant customs roles.
- g) There is a maximum of 870 SAMS BFOs, as provided by Border Force colleagues. In the absence of a breakdown of grades ranging from Border Force Assistant Officer (BFAO) to Border Force Senior Officer (BFSO), an equal distribution is taken in the central scenario, and a distribution weighted towards BFAO and BFSO is taken in the low scenario and high scenario, respectively. The labour cost estimates are derived from the internal Home Office Staff Cost Model which have been inflated to 2025/26 prices.
- h) Familiarisation costs are estimated using the formula:

reading time x median wage x number of readers.

- 311. All measures incur **prison construction costs** which reflect the cost of increasing prison capacity. The unit cost per prison place is £524,086 in 2025/26 prices. 20 per cent optimism bias for standard building projects is applied to reflect potential optimism in the unit cost. For measures that have no steady state prison place impact, the maximum over the 10 year appraisal period is used.
- 312. Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials and Border Force extension of powers measures incur **legal aid costs** which reflect the cost of legal aid provided at police stations and the Crown and Magistrates' Courts. The unit cost for the Crown Court legal aid is dependent on the offence category; CSA related crimes have a unit cost of £9,978 in the 2025/26 prices, and obstruction related crimes (relevant for Border Force extension of powers) have a unit cost of £8,163. The unit costs for magistrates' courts and police station legal aid are £553 and £266 respectively.
- 313. Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials and Border Force extension of powers measures incur **court costs**. Court costs are £873 in the Magistrates' Court and £5,374 in the Crown Court, in 25/26 prices.
- 314. All measures incur **probation costs** which reflect the cost of monitoring community and licence offenders. The unit costs for community offenders and licence offenders without electric monitoring are £3,298 and £4,689 respectively in 2025/26 prices.
- 315. All measures incur **prison services costs** which reflect the annual running costs per place. The cost is £63,889 per year in 2025/26 prices with 20 per cent optimism bias applied.

COSTS

Direct Costs

Transition Costs

Table 11: Direct Transition Costs, £ million, 2025/26 prices, Present Value, 10-year total

	Low	Central	High
AI models Total	-0.12	0.00	0.22
Familiarisation cost	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prison construction costs	-0.12	0.00	0.22
Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials Total	0	0	1.57
Familiarisation Costs	NA	NA	NA
Prison construction costs	0.00	0.00	1.57
Administrators and moderators Total	2.88	3.93	5.00
Familiarisation cost	0.00	0.00	0.01
Prison construction costs	2.88	3.93	4.99
Border Force extension of powers Total	0.23	0.53	0.88
Familiarisation Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prison construction costs	0.23	0.53	0.88
CSA Measures Total	3.00	4.46	7.76

Source: Home Office internal analysis, 2024. Rounded to nearest £10,000. Figures may not sum due to rounding

316. The total direct transition costs for the CSA measures are between £3 million and £8 million, with a central estimate of £4 million. Transition costs include familiarisation costs and prison construction costs.
317. The administrators and moderators measure has the highest transition costs, which are mostly comprised of prison construction costs. The measure is expected to increase prison places by between 27 and 47 across 10 years, with a central estimate of 37. The maximum annual prison volume is between 5 and 8 in year 10 of the appraisal period, with a central estimate of 6.
318. Familiarisation costs vary between measures due to the length of guidance and groups of people required to read them. The longest estimated guidance is for administrators and moderators; 2 pages. The estimated reading time calculated using the ReadingSoft calculator is 0.01 to 0.15 hours, 0.05 hours in the central scenario. Familiarisation costs for the administrators and moderators measure range from £249 in the low scenario to £5,959 in the high scenario, with a central estimate of £1,473.

Ongoing costs

Table 12: Direct Ongoing Costs, £ million, 2025/26 prices, Present Value, 10-year total

	Low	Central	High
AI models Total	-0.06	0.03	0.18
Probation Costs	0.02	0.03	0.04
Prison Services Costs	-0.08	0.00	0.15
Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials Total	0.01	0.00	1.60
Legal Aid	0.01	0.00	0.26

Court Costs	0.00	0.00	0.12
Probation Costs	0.00	0.00	0.15
Prison Services Costs	0.00	0.00	1.06
Administrators and moderators Total	1.51	2.06	2.62
Probation Costs	0.12	0.16	0.20
Prison Services Costs	1.40	1.90	2.42
Border Force extension of powers Total	0.68	1.40	2.18
Legal Aid	0.10	0.21	0.31
Court Costs	0.21	0.41	0.62
Probation Costs	0.16	0.32	0.49
Prison Services Costs	0.20	0.46	0.77
CSA Measures Total	2.14	3.49	6.58

Source: Home Office internal analysis, 2024. Rounded to nearest £10,000. Figures may not sum due to rounding.

319. The total ongoing costs for the CSA measures are between £2.14 million and £6.58 million, with a central estimate of £3.49 million.
320. The measure with the largest ongoing costs is administrators and moderators' measure. These are due to the increased sentence lengths for administrator and moderator offenders who are estimated to spend an additional 12.4 months in prison as a result of being charged with the new offence rather than current less relevant offences. The majority of these costs are prison services costs which have a unit cost of £65,406 in 2025/26 prices with 20 per cent optimism bias applied.

Indirect Costs

Table 13: Indirect Transition Costs, £ million, 2025/26 prices, Present Value, 10-year total

	Low	Central	High
Border Force extension of powers Total	8.36	17.69	27.97
Prison construction costs	8.36	17.69	27.97
CSA Measures Total	8.36	17.69	27.97

Source: Home Office internal analysis, 2024. Rounded to nearest £10,000. Figures may not sum due to rounding

Table 14: Indirect Ongoing Costs, £ million, 2025/26 prices, Present Value, 10-year total

	Low	Central	High
Border Force extension of powers Total	16.32	33.48	51.47
Legal Aid	4.15	8.30	12.44
Court Costs	2.77	5.54	8.30
Probation Costs	2.09	4.18	6.26
Prison Services Costs	7.31	15.47	24.46
CSA Measures Total	16.32	33.48	51.47

Source: Home Office internal analysis, 2024. Rounded to nearest £10,000. Figures may not sum due to rounding

321. The only measure with monetised indirect costs is the Border Force extension of powers measure. The indirect costs arise from the additional CSA offenders detected as a result of an expected increase of digital searches. 30 per cent of pilot stops resulted in possession of IIOC intelligence that is reported to the police. Scenario analysis takes the assumptions that 25 to 75 per cent of reported intelligence results in a charge. A nine per cent charge to proceeding rate is then applied, derived from police recorded crime charges data and CJS outcomes data for the existing offence. **The total indirect costs range from £24.68 million to £79.45 million, with a central estimate of £51.16 million.**
322. Whilst indirect costs cover additional offenders detected at the border, the CSA intelligence/justice system may well identify the offenders at a later point in time, particularly those stops driven by intelligence. It is not possible to estimate what proportion of offenders may be stopped at a later time but given the stops are driven by a range of factors which arouse suspicion at the Border but are hampered by existing powers of search it is assumed that these offenders would not be additional to the justice system, and rather detected and charged at an earlier point in time, which would also prevent some level of victimisation. The associated costs have been monetised for completeness but should be considered as costs displaced from other parts of the intelligence/CJS. The benefits of detecting offenders at the border before they go on to continue offending is detailed in the benefits.

Non monetised Costs

323. Many of the measures incur costs that have not been monetised due to uncertainty and an absence of data on the quantifiable impact of the measures. These costs include increased caseload for police officers and technology investment.
324. Where measures are expected to increase the number of charges, a cost will arise from increased caseload for police officers. These are relevant for possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials and Border Force extension of powers measures. The possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials is expected to increase the number of cases over

10 years by between 0 and 27, taking 0 in the central scenario, where the central scenario is based on the prevalence of paedophile manuals estimated to be AI related as outlined in paragraph 297.

325. Border Force extension of powers is expected to result in 1,240 annual direct offences. Assuming 100 per cent of these are reported to the police, and 25 to 75 per cent will be charged, the number of cases for Border Force extension of powers' direct impact is estimated to be 310 to 930 per year, taking 620 in the central scenario. These have not been monetised due to the absence of data on the unit cost for a police case.
326. The technology required to detect AI models for CSAM is not yet available. There is a large amount of uncertainty on the development of this technology and the timelines for when it will be ready for use. Costs will arise from investing in the technology and training intelligence personnel in the use of the technology, but due to uncertainty and the absence of data this has not been included in the monetised costs.
327. The analysis has considered the cost of training Border Force officers in the use of the tool which supports the extension of Border Force Powers measure. The cost is sunk as the training has already been undertaken following the pilot at all ports and is therefore not included in VfM of the measure.

BENEFITS

Non-monetised benefits

328. Implementing the duty will help safeguard children and deter offenders, and repeat offenders, by making it an offence to engage in AI related child sexual abuse and to be in possession of CSAM. This will bring multiple benefits to victims, their families and society. However, it has not been possible to monetise such benefits due to an absence of existing data or literature which can be used to estimate the expected crime reduction from the measures. The benefits resulting from the measures are however expected to be significant.
329. As an indicator of the scale of costs associated with child sexual abuse, it is estimated that the financial and non-financial (monetised) cost relating to all victims who began to experience, or continued to experience, contact child sexual abuse in England and Wales in the year ending 31 March 2019 to be at least £10.1 billion (at 2018/19 price year)⁹⁸.
330. The unit cost for contact child sexual abuse is estimated to be £89,200 and represents the average cost of a single victim of contact CSA in the cohort of victims in the year ending 31 March 2019.⁹⁹ These figures relate to contact child sexual abuse and cannot be replicated for image-based offending due to the repeated nature and ongoing traumatisation suffered by individuals when images are reshared. But this gives some sense of the extent of harms incurred by victims of child sexual abuse.
331. The measures intend to limit the pool of people either proliferating, creating, and facilitating access to child sexual abuse images and deter others from engaging in these types of activities through AI generation. By focusing on higher harm detections and stopping offending earlier

⁹⁸ Home Office, 2021, The Economic and Social Cost of Contact Child Sexual Abuse. Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-economic-and-social-cost-of-contact-child-sexual-abuse/the-economic-and-social-cost-of-contact-child-sexual-abuse>

⁹⁹ Home Office, 2021, The Economic and Social Cost of Contact Child Sexual Abuse. Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-economic-and-social-cost-of-contact-child-sexual-abuse/the-economic-and-social-cost-of-contact-child-sexual-abuse>

there should be a resultant benefit of a reduction in available content and likely offending for possession of CSAM. However, it is not possible to quantify such a displacement.

Table 15: Non-monetised Benefits for Measures to Address Online and Artificial Intelligence Related Child Sexual Abuse

Proposal	Non-monetised Benefits
AI models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases barriers to possession of digital tools designed to create synthetic CSA material. • Deters the use of digital tools designed to create synthetic CSA material. • Limits the pool of people creating and proliferating CSA material, reducing harm to victims and improving the safeguarding of children.
Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fills a gap in legislation. • Criminalises pseudo-paedophile manuals to the same extent as 'real' paedophile manuals, reflecting the severity of synthetic CSA material. • Deters the possession of AI paedophile manuals. • Limits the pool of people proliferating and creating CSA material, reducing harm to victims, and improving the safeguarding of children.
Administrators and moderators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate sentence reflects the severity of offences currently being charged with less severe offences. • Reduces charges and offenders for other related offences. • Deters the provision and maintenance of an electronic service that facilitates online child sexual abuse. • Limits the pool of people facilitating access to CSA material, reducing harm to victims and improving the safeguarding of children.
Border Force extension of powers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases intelligence gathered on CSA offenders at the Border. • Introduces a 'double lock' effect, whereby the wilful obstruction offence reduces an individual's likelihood of refusing a digital device search. • Improves capabilities at the border to detect travelling child sex offenders. • Indirect CSA offenders are detected earlier than they otherwise would have been without the tool at the border, allowing action to be taken earlier and reducing their time spent offending. • Limits the pool of people in possession of CSA material, reducing harm to victims and improving the safeguarding of children.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

332. The Net Present Social Value (NPSV) of the measures direct impact is estimated to range between **£-5.14 million and £-14.26 million, with a central estimate of £-7.96 million (PV)** over the 10-year appraisal period.
333. The Net Present Social Value (NPSV) of the measures including the indirect impact is estimated to range between **£-29.82 million and £-93.70 million, with a central estimate of £-59.12 million (PV)** over the 10-year appraisal period.
334. As there is no cost to business, **both the Business Net Present Value (BNPV) and the new cost (EANDCB¹⁰⁰) to business is zero.**

¹⁰⁰ The net direct cost to business is defined as the Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost to Business (EANDCB) and is a measure used by the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) to assess the regulatory burden on business.

Table 16: Summary costs, benefits, NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB £ million (PV), 10 years

Summary of Costs and Benefits	Low	Central	High
Costs			
Set-up costs			
Private sector set-up costs	0.00	0.00	0.00
Public sector set-up costs	11.36	22.15	35.65
Total set-up costs	11.36	22.15	35.65
Ongoing Costs			
Private sector ongoing costs	0.00	0.00	0.00
Public sector ongoing costs	18.46	36.97	58.06
Total ongoing costs	18.46	36.97	58.06
Total costs			
Benefits			
Private sector benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00
Public sector benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00
Net Present Social Value	-29.82	-59.12	-93.70
Business Net Present Value	0.00	0.00	0.00
Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost of Business	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Home Office internal analysis

Table 17: Option 1 NPSV, £ million 2025/26 prices, central case, 10 years

Costs	NPSV
AI models	0.03
Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials	0.00
Administrators and moderators	6.00
Border Force extension of powers (including indirect costs)	53.09
Total costs (including indirect costs)	59.12
Net benefit	-59.12

Source: Home Office internal analysis, 2024. Rounded to nearest £10,000. Figures may not sum due to rounding

Value for money (VfM)

335. The non-monetised benefits associated with the preferred option, such as the safeguarding of children, may counteract the negative NPV in the scenarios.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

General assumptions and data

336. It is currently not possible to estimate the change in DBS check volumes resulting from the new requirements. This is due to a lack of data on the numbers affected meaning that the corresponding costs are non-monetised. Whilst efforts have been made to understand the impacts on all affected groups, because both the costs and benefits cannot be monetised, they have been qualitatively assessed instead.

Costs

To Business

337. The eligibility change from this provision will make some roles eligible for an enhanced with children's barred list check, rather than the enhanced only check. These types of check have the same DBS fee, so the cost to employers who use the highest level of check which they can access will remain the same. Due to this, costs to business are expected to be low.

338. It is possible that some employers are not making use of the current eligibility for checks and are not currently undertaking enhanced checks or any check at all. This change will present a higher cost to those who now are required, or feel inclined, to undertake an enhanced with children's barred list check, and had not undertaken this previously. As there is no data on the number of employers in this position, the corresponding costs cannot be calculated.

To government

339. Running additional enhanced with barred list checks by DBS is not expected to incur significant additional costs for the DBS as the barring check element is a largely automated function.

340. 2022/23 figures show that a majority of the enhanced checks run by the DBS are already the higher-level with barring checks (4,232,872) rather than the enhanced without barring checks (267,720). The data shows that DBS is used to dealing with these checks and if the new requirements shift applications from enhanced to enhanced with barring, they are likely to be able to handle this.

341. RA providers have the duty to refer to the DBS any person who the RA providers have removed from RA due to that person having caused harm or posing a risk of harm to children. If more roles are brought within the scope of RA, there may be a higher demand for consideration of such referrals, with staffing implications. As there is no firm evidence on the precise number of roles that will be brought into RA, this resource demand for the DBS cannot be calculated.

342. To provide some context, in 2022/23 4,232,872 enhanced with barred list checks were issued, most of which for roles in RA, and 267,720 enhanced DBS checks were issued. The supervision exemption will account for some, but not all of the applications for enhanced without barred list checks. In the same year DBS received 8,290 referrals for barring which is 0.2 per cent of the number of those eligible for barred list checks. Based on these figures alone, the Home Office can provide a rough estimate that the number of referrals would go up by no more than 535 referrals (and likely to be considerably fewer as the numbers brought into RA is likely to be much lower than the 2022/23 figure for those receiving enhanced checks).

343. Based on these figures, DBS have confirmed that they would be able to handle the extra capacity required and although this could require extra staff, they were unable to provide sufficiently detailed estimates of these costs for them to be monetised.

Benefits

344. The qualitative benefit of this change is the increase in safeguarding, particularly the reduction in the risk that a barred person can work closely and frequently with children in a supervised capacity. As the number of barred persons who will be prevented from working with children by this measure is not known, this benefit cannot be calculated.
345. Bringing roles into RA also means that those who have harmed or have caused a risk of harm to children and been removed from their role as a result, will be referred to DBS to be considered for barring. This further reduces the risk that those who pose a risk of harm will work with children, whether in a supervised or unsupervised capacity.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

346. As the costs and benefits have been assessed qualitatively it has not been possible to calculate a NPSV figure.
347. BNPV and EANDCB have not been calculated but costs to businesses are likely to be low considering that enhanced with barring checks cost the same as enhanced only and already form a majority of the enhanced checks that take place.

Proposal 8: Grooming as an Aggravating Factor

General Assumptions and Data

348. It has not been possible to quantify the impacts for this measure due to a lack of data on the volume and the impact on sentence length of aggravating factors. Additionally, the use of aggravating factors is at the discretion of judges, so the impact on their sentencing decisions is unknown. Adding grooming behaviour as a statutory aggravating factor is anticipated to require additional investigative and evidential gathering by the police and CPS to evidence grooming behaviour in connection to sexual offences and there may also be Legal Aid Agency costs if cases take longer at court due to the additional evidence being presented.

Costs

349. It has not been possible to quantify any costs for this measure at this point due to the limited data available, such as on the prevalence of this factor within sexual offending or how grooming is already considered in cases where it is already identified and treated as an aggravating factor. It is expected that there will be additional investigative work and evidential gathering required by the police and CPS to evidence grooming behaviour in connection to sexual offences.
350. There may also be additional CPS and Legal Aid Agency costs if cases take longer at court due to the additional evidence being presented. Whilst cases potentially taking longer at court is not expected to have direct additional costs for HMCTS, this may have a knock-on effect for other cases by delaying their start.
351. It is expected that, on average, this measure would increase sentence lengths for relevant offences which would have prison place impacts.

Benefits

352. This measure will reflect the seriousness with which this government responds to this type of offending. This will be an important step in the government's mission to halve violence against women and girls in the next decade, and its commitment to provide meaningful change for

victims impacted by these horrendous crimes. This will be in addition to the government's implementation of the recommendations of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse.

353. It will aggravate the sentences of offenders who demonstrate grooming behaviours in connection to sexual offences against those aged under 18 and those who knowingly take advantage of children who they know to have been groomed by others.
354. It will enable courts to ensure that those who groom children face the toughest possible sentences for their crimes, giving victims and the public confidence that justice has been served.

E. Wider Impacts

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

355. The policy is assumed to primarily affect the CJS and agencies that provide identity documents. This effect has been set out in the appraisal section of the EN.

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

356. These measures are concentrated on improving clarity around police and other related agencies operational processes and no wider impacts have been identified.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

357. The new CCE offence is not expected to have a business impact, meaning there will be no material impact on smaller businesses, trade, or investment within the UK.
358. Similarly, there are no anticipated impacts on the environment or on wealth distribution as a result of this policy.
359. There may be varying impacts for different geographical areas of England and Wales. County Lines gangs are known to predominantly operate from London, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester¹⁰¹, meaning that these areas are more likely to see higher levels of potential impacts. However, CCE is present across the country and will not be limited to these areas.
360. Although the proposed offence does not target specific individuals, beyond those involved in CCE, there may also be disproportionate impacts of this policy on certain ethnicities. According to the 2024 CiN data¹⁰², children from ethnic minorities and Black children are overrepresented in the cohort of vulnerable children, making up 32 per cent and 9 per cent of the cohort

¹⁰¹ These are the four exporter areas for county lines where heightened activity is seen. Sourced here: <https://www.npcc.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/publications/publications-log/national-crime-coordination-committee/2024/county-lines-strategic-threat-risk-assessment.pdf>

¹⁰² CiN data shows that ethnic minorities are disproportionately involved in CCE, 9.3 per cent of the vulnerable children were black. <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-in-need>

respectively. Similarly, County Lines data¹⁰³ show that individuals of Black ethnicity that are linked to County Lines (as both offenders and victims) are over-represented in all regions of the UK.

Proposal 4: Strengthening Stalking Protection Orders

361. The policy is expected to primarily affect the CJS. This effect has been set out in the appraisal section of the EN.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

362. Cuckooing has a wider impact on communities by facilitating criminal activity, particularly drug dealing, and contributing to anti-social behaviour. Enhancing the response of police and support services to instances of cuckooing could reduce these impacts, creating benefits at both an individual, community, and societal level.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

363. The policy is expected to primarily affect the CJS. This effect has been set out in the appraisal section of the EN.

364. The policy is expected to primarily affect the CJS. This effect has been set out in the appraisal section of the EN.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

365. This measure is focused on increasing safeguarding within the context of employment in the child workforce. No wider impacts have been identified.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

366. The policy is expected to primarily affect the CJS. This effect has been set out in the appraisal section of the EN.

F. Sensitivity

367. None of the measures in this EN are regulatory provisions as defined under the Better Regulation Framework. The equivalent annual net direct costs to the public sector are less than +/- £20 million, so an IA is not required. This Economic Note has been produced instead and contains proportionate analysis outlining the main costs, benefits, and NPSV calculations.

¹⁰³ In all regions, individuals of Black ethnicity, where recorded, are over-represented in comparison to the regional population data. Sourced from:
<https://www.npcc.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/publications/publications-log/national-crime-coordination-committee/2024/county-lines-strategic-threat-risk-assessment.pdf>

G. Risks

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

366. **Indefinite requirements.** There is a risk that the annual growth rate for RSO releases may vary from the 0.53 per cent assumption. The use of RSOs sentenced to three plus years in immediate custody as a proxy for the proportion of RSOs to be placed on indefinite requirements impending release instead of the full 30 plus month period¹⁰⁴ may cause overestimations of the number of RSOs placed on indefinite requirements. This is the granularity of the MoJ outcomes data, and the closest interval was used to generate the most accurate estimate possible.
368. **Registered sex offender preference to remain on Indefinite Requirements.** Stakeholder engagement with the police revealed that there are RSOs who prefer to remain on indefinite notification requirements as this provides both structure and security in their lives post-release. The need for RSO approval may cause overestimation.
369. **Name change ban.** The use of data on RSOs who willingly notified the police of a name/alias change to estimate the quantity of missing RSOs in scope may have caused underestimation as certain RSOs may try to change their name and not notify the police. These risks have been mitigated by using sensitivity analysis to account for uncertainty and generate variance in the volumes required.
370. **Sensitivity analysis.** The sensitivity analysis accounting for unreported breaches of notification requirements is not based on police intelligence, due to a lack of granular breach data. To account for uncertainty the modelling used wide sensitivity analysis to generate a range of cost projections.
371. **Higher rates of reoffending in registered sex offenders convicted of child offences.** Part D of the preferred policy may encourage covert behaviour as previously compliant RSOs may feel victimised by the legislation. The risk will be mitigated by open communication from offender managers to preserve the working relationship between the offender managers and the RSO.
372. **Court, legal aid and prison unit costs.** The MoJ have suggested that the court and legal aid unit cost figures may represent an underestimation of the genuine cost to the CJS, as well as uncertainty surrounding the ongoing prison unit costs. To mitigate this risk, a 20 per cent optimism bias rate has been applied to the unit costs.
373. **Infrastructure and systems effects.** The name change ban implementation will require a number of agencies to update current and implement new systems. This may require significant lead time, and the costs of a prospective automated system have been omitted by this appraisal, potentially leading to an underestimation of overall costs.
374. **Increase in Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme applications.** The CSODS measure may lead to an increase in the number of applications to forces which will increase the administrative burden on the police. The analysis has mitigated this risk using scenario analysis with informed percentages in the low, central, and high scenarios.

¹⁰⁴ Information: Sex offence notification requirements – Unlock: <https://unlock.org.uk/advice/information-sex-offence-notification-requirements/#:~:text=Indefinite%20notification,-In%20April%202010&text=This%20is%20currently%2015%20years.first%20notification%20to%20the%20Police.>

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

375. The proposed measures do not appear to pose any large risks; however, the following have been identified as considerations:

- a) As further engagement with sector stakeholders and the police is required to develop the guidance, the length of the guidance is currently unknown, nor who will be required to read it, nor the level of familiarisation that will be needed across the sector.
- b) Evidence that police are currently taking a risk averse approach, not releasing identifying information on suspects, for fear of breaching data protection legislation, is anecdotal evidence and not based on quantitative data.

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

Analytical risk 1: data quality

376. There is limited data available on the prevalence of CCE and number of offenders, leading to significant uncertainty in the estimated impacts. For example, the prevalence estimates from CiN include all children at risk of CCE, not just those who have been victims, potentially overestimating the volumes of victims. On the other hand, the CiN data will be an underestimate of the true prevalence as they exclude children not known to social services. These uncertainties in the data are mitigated through the use of three analytical methods.

377. To mitigate this risk, the analysis is developed using three different methods, based on different data sources. These three methods produce overlapping estimates of the volumes of additional offenders and prison places, which mitigates some of this risk and increases the confidence in the analysis.

378. The analysis underpinning the three methods also uses a range of input values for key assumptions. The chosen ranges are wider where inputs are more uncertain, for instance based on internal management data, and narrower where they are based on more reliable sources such as published data.

Analytical risk 2: non-monetised costs and benefits

379. The lack of high quality evidence on the prevalence of CCE prevented analysts from monetising potential benefits that may arise from a reduction in CCE offending due to this policy. The extent to which the policy may reduce prevalence is also unknown and unsupported by evidence.

380. Additionally, the potential increase in police resource required to monitor orders, and any additional demand for support and safeguarding services remain uncertain and have not been costed in the analysis.

Policy risk 1: uncertainty around the implementation data

381. As this policy is part of the wider Crime and Policing Bill, dates for Royal Assent and implementation are uncertain and subject to wider considerations. The analysis assumes that the policy will come into force in FY 2026/27, with reduced impacts in the first year of the offence. The ongoing steady state for impacts is assumed to commence from 2027/28 onwards.

Policy risk 2: effective use of the offence

382. Stakeholder feedback from police forces has identified difficulties with obtaining charges and convictions under existing modern slavery offences. If these difficulties persist, sensitivity analysis conducted by using the existing charge rate for MS suggests that there would be no additional convictions from the new offence, thereby limiting its impact.
383. However, the new offence has been designed specifically to address evidential challenges posed by existing legislation. In addition, statutory guidance on the new offence is being developed to mitigate this risk, increasing the likelihood of additional charges and convictions, increasing the benefits of the new offence.

Proposal 4: Strengthening Stalking Protection Orders

384. It has not been possible to monetise the prospective benefit of the positive requirements reducing levels of reoffending due to an absence of well evidenced, available data on the potential success of the positive requirement programmes in the stalking perpetrator context. The omission of this benefit in the Net Present Value estimates may lead to an underestimation of the cost savings generated by the policy.
385. The **displacement rate** of restraining orders to SPOs is not based on well evidenced data. There is no data readily available on the relationship between restraining orders and SPOs. It has not been possible to predict the counterfactual for the new SPOs that will be issued. To mitigate this risk, a wide sensitivity analysis has been incorporated into the analysis. The displacement rate range of 0 to 100 per cent accounts for uncertainty over the new SPOs.
386. The **18 per cent annual growth rate in stalking convictions** is based on data from 2019 to 2020. Although this is the most applicable time period in terms of the recording process for stalking cases, it is dated compared to the initial price year and subsequent appraisal period and could lead to under/overestimates.
387. The **marginal propensity to breach and custody rates of breaching a restraining order and SPO** are modelled to remain the same throughout the appraisal period. The stalking perpetrators issued an SPO at conviction or acquittal may have a higher likelihood to breach an SPO due to having reached the threshold to be taken to court. This may lead to a higher custody rate for these SPOs. To mitigate this risk, wide sensitivity analysis has been used in the form of the displacement rate to generate a significant range in the monetised impacts of the policy.
388. The **positive requirement programmes may not have the capacity** to work with and rehabilitate an increased number of stalking perpetrators. One of the key non-monetised benefits within the analysis is the potential reduction in reoffending as a result of the positive requirement programmes. The analysis assumes that the programme providers will have the capacity to assist the higher levels of stalking perpetrators that are mandated positive requirements as a part of the SPO. This potential risk has not been tested with external programme providers of the positive requirements.

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

Analytical Risk 1: Absence of well evidenced national prevalence estimates

389. National data on the prevalence of cuckooing cases are limited, resulting in significant uncertainty in the cost estimate, particularly to the CJS. However, this analysis likely overestimates the impact to the prison system by modelling all cuckooing sentences consecutively, whereas in practise sentences could be applied concurrently.
390. If sentencing for this offence is applied concurrently, which is at the discretion of the court on a case-by-case basis, then the cost impact may be minimal or negligible, depending on the underlying offence (e.g. drugs supply).

Analytical Risk 2: Unable to monetise all costs and benefits of this policy

391. The lack of a standardised national approach to cuckooing has prevented analysts from monetising potential benefits that may arise from a reduction in prevalence due to this policy. The extent to which the policy may reduce prevalence is also unknown and unsupported by evidence.
392. Additionally, the potential increase in demand for support and safeguarding services remains uncertain, and inconsistencies in national costs and approaches have prevented these from being costed in the analysis.

Policy Risk 1: Risk of CCE victims being criminalised

393. A cuckooing offence could risk incriminating victims of CCE who are involved in cuckooing activity. As part of the county lines model, young people are often sent to take over properties to deal drugs and 'run' the property and could be captured by an offence that criminalises control of a dwelling for criminal purposes.
394. To mitigate this risk, the Home Office will provide clear guidance to police and engage closely with the CPS, on how to use the offence to target those ultimately directing the cuckooing, rather than those who are found in the properties who could also be victims of CCE.

Policy Risk 2: Victims may refuse to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination

395. The cuckooing offence targets the non-consensual control of a dwelling (the victim's home) for a criminal purpose/s. This may mean victims of cuckooing could be unwilling to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination.
396. To mitigate this risk, the Home Office will provide clear guidance to police on how they can achieve victim engagement.

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse:

a) AI models

397. **Unknown timelines for technology availability.** The technology to detect AI tools is not yet available and there is little evidence surrounding the likely availability. The risk is that technology is not available until years beyond the base year, significantly reducing estimated costs of the model. The analysis takes a maximum approach, following the assumption that the technology is available in the base year.
398. **Uncertainty surrounding the prevalence of AI.** The prevalence of AI tools is unknown. In the absence of evidence, the analysis uses a proxy of the prevalence of AI CSAM (0.02 per cent). There is limited evidence surrounding this proxy, however, of the available sources, a maximum approach has been taken.
399. The rate of change of AI is unknown. There is limited evidence and large uncertainties around the likely prevalence of AI in future years. The analysis uses a proxy of the rate of AI (36 per

cent), taking a maximum approach from available sources, which is estimated to reach a steady state after five years.

400. **Data quality.** The proxy offence covers possession, distribution, and production of indecent images of children, each with a different maximum sentence. The proposed offence is most akin to the possession element of the proxy offence, but there is no data available to separate the CJS outcomes. Scenario analysis is used to incorporate the separate maximum sentence lengths.

b) Possession of guidance on creating synthetic materials

401. **Unknown prevalence.** The prevalence of AI paedophile manuals is largely unknown, currently only one manual has been detected. Scenario analysis addresses this uncertainty, taking one in the central scenario. The sentence outcomes in the low and high scenarios take the minimum and maximum outcomes over the past 5 years for the existing paedophile manual offence.
402. **Uncertainty surrounding the prevalence of AI.** The prevalence of AI tools is unknown. In the absence of evidence, the analysis uses a proxy of the prevalence of AI CSAM (0.02 per cent). There is limited evidence surrounding this proxy, however, of the available sources, a maximum approach has been taken.
403. The rate of change of AI is unknown. There is limited evidence and large uncertainties around the likely prevalence of AI in future years. The analysis uses a proxy of the rate of AI (36 per cent), taking a maximum approach from available sources, which is estimated to reach a steady state after five years.

c) Administrators and moderators

404. **Uncertainty surrounding future case numbers.** The number of cases for the new offence is difficult to estimate due to the lack of any relevant proxy offence. Scenario analysis is used to address this analysis. The low scenario takes the current number of cases NCA are investigating, and the high scenario takes the case outcomes from the past year.
405. The creation of the offence is expected to increase the number of investigations over time as the NCA can target offenders with more success, but the scale of this is uncertain. The analysis takes a reasonable proxy from discussions with the NCA, increasing the number of investigations by eight per cent each year. This reaches a steady state after Year eight at which the Home Office expect the NCA to reach operational capacity.
406. This assumption is likely a maximum given the requirement for the NCA to refocus investigations to these higher harm individuals. This is the best assumption given the lack of evidence.

d) Border Force extension of powers

407. **Uncertainty surrounding scaling the pilot outcomes.** The analysis is modelled off the outcomes of an internal operational pilot. This has been scaled from 4 days in 2 airports to 365 days in 13 airports. The analysis has assumed the operational activity in the pilot represents the annual average. This does not account for potential fluctuations in passenger volumes throughout the different ports or time of year. Following discussions with Border Force colleagues and considering the limited data available, this assumption was carried forward based on simplicity.
408. **Uncertainty surrounding wilful obstruction offence volumes.** The pilot was run prior to the creation of the wilful obstruction offence. The number of individuals refusing a search is likely to be less with the consequence of arrest, upon which their devices will then be searched. It is

possible that wilful obstruction offences will be lower in practice but a maximum approach is taken.

409. The wilful obstruction offence includes assault of a customs and border force officer, which in theory should receive harsher custodial sentences than the obstruction component. Without granular data of the offence outcomes, an average has been taken. It is possible the sentencing outcomes in the high scenario are an overestimate.

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service

Supervision Exemption

408. The proposed measure does not appear to pose any large risks.

409. However, there is a risk that some roles being newly brought into RA will result in employers not fully understanding their duties as RA providers. The Home Office will address this through working with the DBS and others to ensure that clear guidance is issued to those affected.

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravating Factor

410. The proposed measure does not appear to pose any large risks; however, the following have been identified as considerations:

- a. It is expected that there will be additional investigative work and evidential gathering required by the police and CPS to evidence grooming behaviour.
- b. There also may be additional CPS and Legal Aid Agency costs of cases take longer at court due to the additional evidence being presented. This may have a knock-on effect for other cases by delaying their start if evidence takes longer to be presented.
- c. Additionally, it is expected that this measure would increase sentence lengths for relevant offenders which would have prison place implications.

H. Annex A: Equality Impact Assessments

Proposal 1: Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>The Home Office's assessment of this duty found that the notification requirement and name-change ban reforms would not lead to direct discrimination, as it would apply equally to everyone, regardless of protected characteristic.</p> <p>Based on the data assessed, people with certain protected characteristics are more likely to be impacted by a name-change ban or the notification requirement reform than those who do not. Based on the evidence available, certain groups (white young men) are more likely to be affected by a name-change ban for RSOs or the notification requirement reform as they form the majority of perpetrators of sexual offences. While the effects of the reforms may amount to indirect discrimination by harming members of this group disproportionately, it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate policy goal of reducing RSOs' risk of sexual harm to the public (and certain members of the public such as children).</p> <p>Due to the limited data available, it is difficult to anticipate whether the reforms will cause any negative ramifications between those in protected characteristic groups and others. However, the reforms include the introduction of virtual notifications. The inclusion of this measure aims to make it easier for vulnerable offenders with protected characteristics to comply with the various notification requirements. The name-change ban does include exemptions to account for particular protected characteristics that might be impacted by the ban.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Proposal 2: Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>Under limb 1 of the Public Sector Equality Duty, the Home Office found no evidence of direct discrimination for either of the policy measures, however it is acknowledged that some options could disproportionately impact men, younger people and white people where there is some (limited) evidence that these groups are more likely to be stalking perpetrators. This can be objectively justified if these measures serve the legitimate purpose of dealing with offending behaviour and protecting victims. In addition, it is estimated that these policy measures would positively benefit groups that are more likely to be stalked such as women, younger people, people with disabilities, bisexual people, transgender people, and people from a mixed ethnic background.</p> <p>Under limb 2 of the Public Sector Equality Duty, it is estimated that these measures could advance equality of opportunity for younger people, women and people from a mixed ethnic background and other groups who are more likely to be victims of stalking. Consideration should also be given to accessibility requirements in any</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>published guidance documents or statistics to ensure they are easily accessible to all.</p> <p>The Department found no evidence under limb 3 of the Public Sector Equality Duty. There is no evidence of prejudice or feelings of distrust between different groups of people in this field, so there is no need to encourage good relations through these policy options.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Proposal 3: Child Criminal Exploitation

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>The public sector equality duty requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and encourage good relations in the course of developing policies and delivering services.</p> <p>The introduction of these CCE measures will have the greatest impact on adults (over the age of 18) as the primary objective of the new standalone offence to criminalise any adult who uses a child for the purpose of involving them in criminal activity.</p> <p>In undertaking an equalities IA, the Home Office have identified that these measures will have a direct impact in relation to age given that the department are limiting culpability to adults (over 18s). The government considers that this is a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aim of protecting children aged under 18 from gangs that lure children and young people into crime. These measures may also have an indirect impact on disability, which is an important vulnerability factor; race, as individuals of black ethnicity are overrepresented as both victims and perpetrators of CCE; and sex, as males are more likely to be involved in CCE as both victims and perpetrators. Such indirect impact, if arising, is expected to be objectively justified.</p> <p>On the available evidence, the Equalities Impact Assessment concluded that this demonstrates compliance, where relevant with section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and that due regard has been made to the need to: eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and encourage good relations.</p> <p>Overall, the government considers that these measures are proportionate. Improving the response to CCE will have a positive impact on all communities.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these findings.</p>	Yes

Proposal 4: Strengthening Stalking Protection Orders

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>Under limb 1 of the Public Sector Equality Duty, the Home Office found no evidence of direct discrimination for this policy measure, however it is acknowledged that this measure could disproportionately impact men, younger people and white people where there is some (limited) evidence that these groups are more likely to be stalking perpetrators so perhaps more likely to receive an SPO on conviction or</p>	Yes

<p>acquittal. However, this can be objectively justified if these measures serve the legitimate purpose of tackling offending behaviour and protecting victims. In addition, it is estimated that this measure would positively benefit groups that are more likely to be stalked such as women, younger people, people with disabilities, bisexual people, transgender people, and people from a mixed ethnic background.</p> <p>Under limb 2 of the Public Sector Equality Duty, it is estimated that this measure could advance equality of opportunity for younger people, women and people from a mixed ethnic background and other groups who are more likely to be victims of stalking. Consideration should also be given to accessibility requirements in any published guidance documents or statistics to ensure they are easily accessible to all.</p> <p>The Home Office found no evidence under limb 3 of the Public Sector Equality Duty. There is no evidence of prejudice or feelings of distrust between different groups of people in this field, so there is no need to encourage good relations through this measure.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Proposal 5: Cuckooing

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>The new offence would have a direct impact in relation to age. The definition of 'consent' within the legislation sets out that a victim can never be deemed to have consented to the control of their property if they are under 18. This means that people aged under 18 may be more likely to receive legal redress for the harm caused to them as it may be easier to prosecute such cases. The government considers that this is a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aim of protecting children aged under 18 who are living independently as occupants of a property and, as such, are particularly vulnerable. Overall, the government considers that the benefits of the measure outweigh any potential risks. People with all protected characteristics are affected by cuckooing, so improving the response to victims of cuckooing will have a positive impact on all communities, demographics, and protected characteristics.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Proposal 6: Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse

<p>The Home Office’s assessment of this duty found that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of the CSA measures would not lead to direct discrimination, as they would apply equally to everyone, regardless of protected characteristic. 2. Based on the data, some people with protected characteristics are more likely to be impacted by the measures. Caucasian men are the majority of perpetrators of child sexual abuse and are more likely to be negatively impacted by one of these measures. While the effects of the measures may amount to indirect discrimination by harming members of this group disproportionately, it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate policy goal of safeguarding children and reducing/preventing further child sexual abuse. 3. The measures are to identify and convict individuals involved in child sexual abuse which will ultimately allow for the safeguarding of children. Therefore, these measures should have a positive impact on children. <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

Proposal 7: Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption

<p>Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>The removal of the supervision exemption would not lead to direct discrimination, as it will apply equally to all those in these supervised roles and on the Barred lists, irrespective of whether they have a protected characteristic.</p> <p>As the supervised roles which would be affected by this change range across different sectors and types of roles, the Home Office cannot say that this change would have a worse effect on any particular group. The effect of this policy is to prevent those who are on the Children’s Barred Lists, who pose a risk of harm to children, from working closely and regularly with children in these supervised roles. This will impact those on the children’s barred list who are working, or who intend to work in these kinds of roles but the children’s barred list is not restricted by any protected characteristic.</p> <p>Whilst there is no evidence to suggest that this will result in indirect discrimination, it is the Home Office’s view that any such impact of this measure would be objectively justified, as it is taken to reduce the risk that a barred person works closely with children, even in supervised roles, making children safer.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Proposal 8: Grooming Aggravated Factor

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	Complete
<p>This measure aggravates offences only where the victim is under 18 year of age, and the offender is aged 18 or over, and where the offending was aided by or involved grooming. The Home Office have not been able to consider its potential effects on the protected characteristics of this specific cohort of offenders as it is not possible to identify all sexual offences with a child victim, as age is not always specified in the offence, and the Home Office do not hold data on the prevalence of grooming in relation to sexual offences.</p> <p>The SRO has agreed these summary findings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

I. Annex B: Summary of all measures

Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance on Stalking and Statutory Guidance on the 'Right to Know'			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
N/A	N/A	N/A	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Gisela Carr	Date: 13/12/24
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Management of registered sex offenders, including notification requirements and restrictions on changing their name			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
15.9	7.3	0	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
8.4	-7.5	0	0
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
25/26	25/26	10	1
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Gisela Carr	Date: 20/12/24
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Cuckooing			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
7.2	4.0	N/A	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
N/A	-7.2	N/A	N/A
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
2025/26	2026/27	10	5
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Caroline Hart	Date: 10/1/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Strengthening Stalking Protection Orders			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
-21.9	-6.2	N/A	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
N/A	21.9	N/A	N/A
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
2025/26	2026/27	10	N/A
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Gisela Carr	Date: 13/12/24
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Child Criminal Exploitation			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
£19.8m	£7.2m	£0.0m	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
N/A	-£19.4m	£0.0m	£0.0m
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
2025/26	2025/26	10	3
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Caroline Hart	Date: 10/01/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Measures to address online and artificial intelligence related child sexual abuse			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
55.62	22.15	0	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
0	-55.62	0	0
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
25/26	25/26	10	1
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Christian Papaleontiu	Date: 30/01/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Disclosure and Barring Service Supervision Exemption			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Shehla Husain	21/01/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25

Grooming as an aggravated factor			
Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
0	0	N/A	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	NPSV (£m PV)	BNPV (£m PV)	EANDCB (£m PV)
0	0	0	0
Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Appraisal period (Years)	Transition period (Years)
25/26	25/26	N/A	N/A
Departmental sign-off (SCS):		Andrew Meads	Date: 24/01/25
Chief Economist sign-off:		Tim Laken	Date: 10/02/25
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:		Emma Kirk	Date: 10/02/25